

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. XIX

NOVEMBER, 1948

No. 11

Roma Semper Eadem

By L. W. SPITZ

Rome ever the same! So says Rome, and her opponents agree; but there is agreement only in the choice of words, not in the sense or connotation. Rome predicates her assertion on the claim that she is the Church founded by Christ and by Him built on Peter, so that even the gates of hell cannot prevail against her. Her opponents, on the other hand, regard her merely as an organization against which the gates of hell have already prevailed in a large measure. Rome presumes to trace her organization and dogma — of course more fully developed in the course of time — back to Christ and the Apostles; her opponents accuse her of a persistently arrogant and intolerant spirit and of obdurate departure from the truth. We shall let Rome speak for herself.

Rome here designates the Roman Catholic Church, for a definition of which we may turn to Konrad Algermissen, who defines his Church thus: "The Church is the one, visible congregation of the faithful, established by Christ and joined to Him, the Head, by the spiritual rebirth of baptism to form one organically constituted body; governed by designated shepherds, who as legitimate successors of the apostles are under the one supreme shepherd appointed by Christ, the Church represents the kingdom of God on earth, leading individual souls to eternal life and in the course of time bringing all mankind back to God, by the truth of the same faith, the holiness of the same law, and the power of the same means of grace."¹ Algermissen defines the Church as a

¹ Konrad Algermissen, *Christian Denominations* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946), p. 82.

visible congregation forming *one organically constituted body, governed* by designated shepherds, under the *one supreme shepherd*. Attention must also be given to the words "the power of the same means of grace." Rome is visible, is governed by the hierarchy, is dogmatically subjected to the sacramental system. It does not improve matters when Algermissen reduces his definition of the Roman Catholic Church to the following statement: "The Church is the mystical body of Christ, consisting of the congregation of those who are joined to Christ, the Head, through faith and the sacraments; as the mystical body of Christ, the Church is perpetually sustained and brought to full maturity in Christ by the grace of the Holy Ghost and through the instrumentality of the ecclesiastical offices, particularly that of the supreme head as the visible representative of Christ."² It must be remembered that the faith here mentioned is not that saving confidence in Christ as the Redeemer by which the believer is saved, but merely the blanket acceptance of Rome's claims; also, the congregation of those joined to Christ, according to Rome, includes the evil as well as the good. It may be added here that whatever Scripture attributes to the *Una Sancta* Rome claims for herself.

Father Cassilly, in his book of instruction for high school pupils, quotes with approval Cardinal Bellarmine's definition: "The Church is the society of men on earth who are united in the profession of one and the same Christian faith, and in the participation of the same sacraments, under the rule of the lawful pastors, and especially of the Roman Pontiff."³ Father Cassilly argues that since the Church is a visible body it must have a visible head. This visible head was Peter, and now it is the pope. Quoting Matt. 16:16-18, he reasons: "Thus He [Christ] compares His Church to a building built on a rock foundation, intending thereby to show that *what a foundation is to a building Peter is to His Church*. Now what does a foundation do for a building? It holds it up, supports it, keeps it together, preserves it. And what is it that supports, holds together, and preserves a society? It is *the principle of authority* which resides in the head. Christ, then, in these

² *Ibid.*

³ Francis Cassilly, *Religion: Doctrine and Practice for Use in Catholic High Schools* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1926), p. 408.

solemn words promised to invest Peter with the principle of authority in the Church, that is, to make him its head and governing power."⁴ Now comes the question: "Who is the successor of St. Peter as visible head of the Church?" Father Cassilly replies: "The Bishop of Rome, commonly called the Pope, or Sovereign Pontiff, is the successor of St. Peter as visible head of the Church."⁵ The minds of Catholic high school pupils are thus prepared for the most extravagant claims of the papacy. In her demands for the hierarchy, with the pope at the head, Rome has not become less bold.

This is also demonstrated by the editor of the Catholic paper *Our Sunday Visitor*, whose editorial on the Church of Christ may serve to introduce the sources of Catholic dogma. The editor printed an advertisement, allegedly taken from the *Joplin Globe*, which reads: "WANTED—To find the Church of Christ; the only church that the Bible speaks of; the church that preaches the Gospel in its primitive purity and calls Bible things by Bible names; speaks where the Bible speaks and is silent where the Bible is silent. Any members of said church that see this ad. please drop me a card at 816 Hill Street, Joplin, Mo. Yours for truth, C. A. Lasater." Alluding to this as a most unique advertisement, the editor of *Our Sunday Visitor* replied in the following words: "The Bible could speak only of the Church which Christ was to establish, or which He had just established. History is a sufficient guide to that Church, which had the whole field from Christ's day until four hundred years ago (exclusive of the Greek and Oriental schismatics). It was the Church which had been known as the *Catholic Church* for fourteen centuries before Luther. If it does not teach the gospel in its primitive purity, then Christ broke His promises. It gave the name *Bible* to the Bible and told the world that the Bible contained God's revelation. The Bible does not speak with authority at all except through the mouth of the Church. (Witness six hundred Christian sects contradicting each other, with the Bible in hand.) Please invite Mr. C. A. Lasater in out of the dark; he asks the favor."⁶ Mr. Lasater was probably surprised if he ever read this answer. He was

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 410.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 416.

⁶ *Our Sunday Visitor*, Oct. 10, 1915.

looking for a church which speaks where the Bible speaks, and not the reverse, making the Bible speak what the church decides it should be saying. He was, furthermore, looking for a church which is silent where the Bible is silent. That cannot be the Roman Catholic Church; the editor of *Our Sunday Visitor* knew better than that. The fourth session of the Council of Trent declared that both saving truth and moral discipline of the faith brought into the world by Christ "are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand; (the Synod) following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety, and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament — seeing that one God is the author of both — as also the said traditions, as well as those pertaining to faith and to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession." The sources of Catholic faith have not changed since the meeting of the Council of Trent. Algermissen explains: "What the Church of Christ, as the spiritual mother of her children, the faithful, proposes for belief through her teaching office, on the basis of the Bible and tradition, is called dogma. . . . God has transmitted the truth to the Church in the Scriptures and in the apostolic traditions. Therefore the Bible and apostolic tradition are the sources of faith."⁷ This is nothing strange — the children learn it in the Catholic parochial schools. In his catechism for these schools, Father W. Faerber declares: "The Catholic Church obtains all that she teaches from Holy Scripture and Tradition."⁸

Father Girardey comments on this answer as follows: "The Pope, the bishops, and the priests do not and may not teach what they fancy, but only what Jesus Christ Himself taught when He was on earth. How do they know what Jesus Christ taught? When you wish to find out something you do not know (e. g., when the battle of New Orleans was

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 238.

⁸ W. Faerber, *Katechismus fuer die katholischen Pfarrschulen der Vereinigten Staaten* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1912), p. 3.

fought), you look into and consult your books. Thus also do the Pope, the bishops, and the priests. We have many books for this; for instance, the Holy Bible, holy books which God inspired men to write, and which contain His word. They have also the books of holy and learned men of former times, and the holy and learned men now living; this is called Tradition, and contains the teachings handed down in the Church from the beginning."⁹

Tradition, revealed truths handed down by word of mouth, the faithful must believe, says Father Cassilly, as taught by the Church. All or most truths of tradition, he says, have now found their way into written books, and the written records of Catholic tradition can be found principally in the decrees of popes and councils, in the sacred liturgies, and in the writings of the Fathers, Doctors, and great theologians of the Church.¹⁰ Pope Pius IX declared: "I am tradition."¹¹ "As taught by the Church," says Father Cassilly. That should eliminate all controversy in Roman Catholic dogma; for: the Church is infallible; the councils are infallible; and the pope is infallible. And inasmuch as the pope's infallibility also extends to the pronouncements on faith and morals of the past, all disputes, including those of the past, should be resolved to the complete satisfaction of all concerned.

If Rome has not changed her attitude with respect to tradition, has she, perhaps, done so with respect to the Bible? Certain Romanist scholars have in recent years given a great deal of attention to the Bible; also certain pronouncements have come from the pope and others which seemingly reveal a change of heart on the part of Rome towards the Bible. Rome will doubtless manifest resentment against any suggestion that her attitude towards the Bible may not have been proper in the past. Under the heading "The 'Open' Bible was Never Closed," the Religious Information Bureau of the Knights of Columbus advertised the following statement: "You probably have heard the remark, at one time or another,

⁹ Ferreol Girardey, *Commentary on the Catechism of Rev. W. Faerber for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1937), p. 10.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 320.

¹¹ E. H. Klotzsche, *Christian Symbolics* (Burlington: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1929), p. 66.

that Catholics were not permitted to read the Bible. The misunderstanding about the attitude of the Catholic Church toward the Bible has even reached the state of fanciful fiction where some people believe the Church made the Bible a 'closed book.' In neither case does a proper understanding of historical truth permit such a misunderstanding to persist."¹² The Bureau states that Bishop Theonas of Alexandria 1,647 years back wrote: "Let no day pass by without reading some portion of the Sacred Scriptures, at such convenient hour as offers, and giving some time to meditation." It reminds the reader that the New Testament, first written in Greek, was translated into Latin by learned men of the Catholic Church in the second or third Christian century. So also was the Old Testament translated from the Greek version of the pre-Christian Jews. "Many centuries before the art of printing was known," it says, "Catholic scholars were translating and copying the Scriptures by hand." Finally, the Bureau claims that before 1520 there were 198 editions of the Bible in the language of the common people—Italian, Spanish, German, French, English, etc., and concludes: "In the face of such historical facts it is impossible for informed persons to believe that the Bible was ever closed, or that Catholics are prohibited from reading it. 'Our one desire for all the Church's children,' wrote Pope Benedict XV in 1920, 'is that, being saturated with the Bible, they may arrive at the all-surpassing knowledge of Jesus Christ.'" So far the advertisement. In reading such advertisements, one is reminded of the fact that Rome is a clever propagandist; but by overstatement she may weaken her case as well as by misstatements. Several points are to be noted. Rome can scarcely claim a bishop of Alexandria of 1647 years ago. The Latin Church of the days of the *Itala* was not like the Rome of today. The number of versions of the Bible or of portions of it in the vernacular was fairly large before 1520, but the question immediately arises: How many of these were produced by the so-called heretics, whose versions were forbidden to the faithful? Finally, when Benedict XV expresses the desire that the Church's children, being saturated with the Bible, may arrive at the all-surpassing knowledge of Jesus Christ, one has the unhappy feeling that in view of Rome's generally cold attitude towards Bible read-

¹² *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, March 9, 1947.

ing the saturation point, speaking in terms of hygrometry, will be quite low.

Such pessimism, however, seems to be unwarranted in the United States. In a tract "Why Catholics Should Read the Bible" the author answers: "Because the Church wants it." He says: "The Bishops of this country, assembled at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, begged the Catholic people to read the Holy Bible. 'We hope,' they said, 'that no family can be found amongst us without a correct version of the Holy Scriptures.' They recommend, furthermore: 'If it be not always feasible in the morning, at least every evening, at a fixed hour, let the entire family be assembled for night prayers, followed by a short reading of the Holy Scriptures, the 'Following of Christ,' or some other pious book' (Pastoral Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States)." Such an attitude on the part of the bishops should have kindled a fire of enthusiasm for Bible reading in the Catholic fold; but it did not. The tract gave another reason for Bible reading which should have been even more potent for Catholic readers. It declared: "Our late Holy Father, Leo XIII, on the 13th day of December, 1898, granted to all the faithful who will read the Holy Gospels for a quarter of an hour each day, an indulgence of three hundred days; and to those who follow this practice for a month, a Plenary Indulgence on any day within the month on which they approach the sacraments and pray for the intention of His Holiness. These indulgences are applicable to the holy souls in Purgatory." The question arises whether "Holy Gospels" here is synonymous with Bible; if so, one would expect a tremendous response in Bible reading throughout the Catholic world. Particularly in Catholic countries, where the pope's will is law, should one expect a pronounced interest in it. If the interest in the Bible was so great during the Middle Ages, when the monks with patience and skill laboriously copied the manuscripts of the Bible, it should be more wide-spread now in the days of the linotype and the rotary press, when Bibles can so easily be acquired. Again one would look for such interest particularly in Catholic countries, where the pope's wishes must be respected. But what do the records show? What about Bible reading in the Latin American countries? What about Italy and Spain? Some Catholic writers attribute the lack of popular Bible

reading in those countries to the prevailing illiteracy. That, however, merely raises another question. Has not Rome been responsible for popular education in those countries? If so, why the illiteracy among the common people? Or does it indeed take Protestant competition to stimulate Rome's commendable achievements in elementary education in countries like the United States?

History is not kind to Rome with respect to its general attitude towards the Bible. Gregory IX wrote 1229: "I forbid the laity to have the books of the Old and New Testaments, except possibly the Psalms, and I strictly prohibit them to have the translation into the language of the people." The Council of Toulouse, 1229, decided that no layman should be permitted to own the books of the Old or New Testaments, nor even the Book of Psalms translated into modern speech. The Synod of Beziers confirmed this resolution, 1233, and later, 1246, established that neither laymen nor priest should be permitted to own the Scriptures in the popular tongue. These resolutions of councils and papal decisions were found necessary as a "precaution to preserve integrity of doctrine and soundness of morals." Etienne de Bourgoon laments that the heretics "know the Gospels or New Testament in the vulgar tongue." Eleven years after Luther's death, in 1557, Pope Paul IV published the Roman Index of Forbidden Books and, with certain exceptions, prohibited laymen from reading the Bible.¹³ Much closer to our own time Pope Clement XI, in the bull *Unigenitus*, 1713, condemned 101 propositions advanced by Quesnel, among them also the following: "The reading of sacred Scripture is for all" (80), and, "the sacred obscurity of the Word of God is no reason for the laity to dispense themselves from its reading" (81). Bible societies which circulate versions of the Scripture other than approved by the Church are condemned. Pope Pius VII, in 1816, declared them to be "a most subtle invention for the destruction of the very foundation of religion." Pope Pius IX designated them as "pests" and placed them in the same category with socialism, Communism and secret societies.¹⁴

¹³ Th. Graebner, *The Dark Ages* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1917), pp. 200—201 *et passim*; W. H. T. Dau, *Luther Examined and Reexamined* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1917), p. 61 ff.

¹⁴ Klotzsche, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

What of today? J. C. Macaulay tells of a group of Christians who for some time have been conducting a campaign of New Testament distribution among the French Canadians of Quebec province. The Cardinal-Archbishop of Quebec, Villeneuve, said of these New Testaments: "This sort of literature can neither be read, kept, nor given to others in good conscience, and the best thing to do if we are insulted by having these writings sent to us is to throw them in the fire."¹⁵ Bonfires are not altogether out of date. Macaulay relates that his friend Dr. Paul Culley, former dean of Wheaton College, has in his possession a Bible which he rescued from a pile of Bibles, Testaments, and Christian literature collected for burning by the Roman Catholic Church in a city of the Philippines as late as 1939. Dr. Culley himself relates the incident in the May issue of the *Philippine Evangelist*. Prizes had been offered for collecting "anti-Catholic" literature, consisting of Bibles, Testaments, Gospels, and portions. There was also a Catholic display, featuring magazines from many parts of the world, lives of popes, and other items, but not a single Bible — not even a Catholic version, nor any portion of the Holy Scripture.¹⁶ The writer's mother once rescued a Bible from being used for kindling a fire in the kitchen stove of a faithful Roman Catholic neighbor, who had received it as a gift. The first pages of Genesis had already been consigned to the flames. Macaulay is puzzled over Rome's denial of suppressing the Bible, when she turns right around and gives her reasons for doing so: like a man who pleads not guilty to the charge of murder and in the same breath tells the court why he murdered his victim. He cites three reasons Rome gives for denying the Scriptures to the people: (1) They cannot understand them. (2) It would smash the Roman unity as it has Protestant unity. (3) It is productive of atheism.¹⁷ Father Girardey has this to say on the subject: "A person may go to heaven without ever reading the Bible, for neither God nor the Church has ever commanded people to read it. Since the Bible is hard to understand, reading the Bible, as experience proves, may do harm to many, who would misunderstand it.

¹⁵ J. C. Macaulay, *Truth vs. Dogma* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1946), page 20 ff.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

We are allowed to keep and read the genuine Bible — that is, the Bible correctly translated, and having notes explaining the difficult passages. The Protestant Bible is not correctly translated; it is a counterfeit Bible, for it is full of errors, and is apt to lead people astray from the truth. The genuine, or Catholic Bible is easily known by its bearing the approval of the Pope or some Catholic bishop, and having notes explaining the difficult passages.”¹⁸ Considering the fact that Catholic versions are generally based on the Vulgate, the text of which is still giving Catholic scholars a good deal of trouble, one may be skeptical about accepting the Catholic Bible as the genuine one. Under the heading “The Book of Books Is a Catholic Book” an advertisement appeared in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, October 19, 1947, in which the Religious Information Bureau of the Knights of Columbus encourages the reading of the Bible in its entirety — or at least the New Testament; but it gives the reader of the advertisement the comforting assurance: “You need not fear that if you don’t read the Bible you will lose your immortal soul. The True Faith, without which it is impossible to please God, comes by hearing God’s revealed Word. From Adam to Moses, God’s Word was not written . . . there were no books of the Old Testament. From Christ’s death to the end of the first century, the New Testament had not been completely written, yet God’s message was taught and believed as it is today. Remember it is not the mere reading of the Bible that is all-important. More important by far is the proper understanding of its teaching and conforming one’s life, not merely to favorite chapters or to verses lifted out of their context, but to God’s message in its entirety.” This sounds quite true, but the phrase “by hearing God’s revealed Word” introduces the entire subject of tradition and the infallible teaching office of the Church. Without the latter, Rome still regards the Bible as Glapion did in Luther’s days, when he declared that the Bible was a book similar to soft wax that could be drawn and twisted as a person liked.¹⁹

Turning now to Rome’s sources of dogma, we find that she accepts the three Ecumenical Creeds, which are in accord

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

¹⁹ W. H. T. Dau, *At the Tribunal of Caesar* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 100.

with the Bible. In the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Melancthon states: "The First Article of our Confession our adversaries approve, in which we declare that we believe and teach that there is *one divine essence, undivided*, etc., and yet, that there are three distinct *persons*, of the same divine essence, and co-eternal, Father, Son, and Holy Ghosot."²⁰ Again, Melancthon says: "The Third Article the adversaries approve, in which we confess that there are in *Christ two natures*, namely, a human nature, assumed by the Word into the unity of His person; and that the same Christ suffered and died to reconcile the Father to us; and that He was raised again to reign, and to justify and sanctify believers, etc., according to the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed."²¹ Herein, too, Rome is still the same. The Roman Catholic Church is a trinitarian body and teaches the deity of Christ. In this respect it is to be commended above many so-called Protestants of today.

God is the almighty Creator of heaven and earth, but Rome shows her adaptability to the exigencies of the times by making room in her doctrine of creation for the theory of evolution. She does not object to this theory as long as the primary creative action of God is admitted. Writing for parochial elementary schools, Father Girardey says: "To create the world God employed six days:"²² Father Cassilly, writing for high schools, is more explicit. He explains: "It is quite a common opinion among Catholic theologians to consider the days of creation as long periods of time."²³ Of the world's age he says: "To this question neither revelation nor science gives a definite answer. Geologists claim for the formations of the various strata of the earth's surface long periods of time; and astronomers tell us that some stars are a million light years from the earth, and as the light of these stars has reached us, it seems very probable that these stars must have been created at least a million years ago. A Catholic is free to hold on this point what he judges to be the sound conclusion of science."²⁴ In accord with this, Algermissen,

²⁰ *Triglot Concordia* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 103; Article I: Of God.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 119; Article III: Of Christ.

²² *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 339.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

explaining the creation, declares: "In addition to the world of pure spirits, the triune God has called into existence a material world which has developed in separate, lengthy periods. The biblical presentation of the six days of creation is an expression of this evolution which took place in protracted periods of time."²⁵ Of man's creation he says: "No science, no research, no digging, leads to the origin of the first man. But the revelation of God teaches us that God in the beginning created a single human couple."²⁶ This statement presents certain problems in view of Algermissen's description of man's creation. He says: "The body of man was formed by God from the slime of the earth. This expression, of course, is not to be taken in the sense of a human forming and building, since God, as a pure spirit, does not shape things with arms and hands. The expression is a figure in the sense that through His will God permitted the human body to take form from the elements of which the things of this world consist. Whether this formation of the human body took place by an instantaneous creation or in the form of a slow evolution from inferior forms, which perhaps required hundreds of thousands of years, the Bible does not say, nor has the Church passed any doctrinal decision concerning it. It is a matter for scientific research, the results of which can change nothing in the fact of man's dependence upon God."²⁷ According to Algermissen, it was possible for the body of man to develop until it was adequate for the reception of a soul, which — so Rome teaches — is directly created by God. The early habitations of the first souls provided rather cramped quarters for them, it seems, for Algermissen says of what he calls primitive men: "Their cranial capacity is far nearer that of modern man than that of the most highly developed animal. They were men with a human soul."²⁸ Their cranial capacity is far nearer that of modern man, but not equal to it. Father Girardey tells the children: "God bestowed also other gifts besides sanctifying grace on our first parents. He gave them a clear mind, capable of easily learning and understanding things. Hence Adam was able to know all animals and give them their right names. Adam and Eve could speak well

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 403.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 404.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 405.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 406.

without having learned to do so."²⁹ How can that be fitted into the picture drawn by Algermissen? Which of the creatures evolving from the earth's slime in the course of hundreds of thousands of years was Adam and received the first soul made directly by God? Rome's theology is still very broad in some areas, where her power and prestige are not endangered.

The anthropology of Rome has not changed to any extent since the Council of Trent. Rome still aims to salvage as much of man's original endowments as possible. To achieve this, she makes a distinction between the natural and the supernatural endowment of man in his original state. The natural image of God is to be found chiefly in man's soul, not in the body. It consists in the spirituality, freedom, and immortality of the soul. The freedom of the will constitutes an integral part of man's nature. The supernatural image of God consists in sanctifying grace, exemption from concupiscence, and immortality of the body. It was the supernatural image of God which man lost in the fall. But in losing it man experienced no important alteration in his nature. The Scotists and the Thomists could not fully agree on the true character of original sin. To the former it was merely something negative, the loss of original righteousness, a special endowment of grace; to the latter it was also something positive, consisting essentially of concupiscence, having its seat in the flesh. The Fathers at Trent did not expressly remove the difference. The decree concerning original sin declares: "If any one does not confess that the first man, Adam, when he had transgressed the commandment of God in Paradise, immediately lost the holiness and justice wherein he had been constituted; and that he incurred, through the offense of that prevarication, the wrath and indignation of God, and consequently death, with which God had previously threatened him, and together with death, captivity under his power who thenceforth *had the empire of death, that is to say, the devil*, and the entire Adam, through that offense of prevarication, was changed, in body and soul, for the worse; let him be anathema."³⁰ The ambiguous word *constitutus* was substituted for *creatus*.

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 57—58.

³⁰ Session V, 1.

Modern Roman dogmaticians have not improved on this description of original sin. Father Cassilly states: "Adam's sin is called original sin, and it has passed to all his descendants, so that all men are conceived and born in sin, that is, deprived of sanctifying grace."³¹ That is, man has merely lost the supernatural endowment which God added to his natural endowment in the beginning. To Father Cassilly original sin seems to be merely something negative; he appears to be a Scotist. Algermissen, on the other hand, introduces also a positive factor; perhaps he may be styled a Thomist. He puts it thus: "Stripped of his pristine holiness, remote from the heart of God, exiled from his Father's house, every child of man enters this world, bearing within himself the seed of death and the inclination to evil."³² Algermissen describes the effects of original sin as follows: "With the disappearance of the soul's supernatural holiness there disappeared also the preternatural gifts which God in the beginning had joined to the grace of divine sonship. The harmony of the natural powers in man, effected by these gifts, was destroyed, so that the sensual appetites tended toward their natural, sensual goals, without consideration for the spiritual soul."³³

Previously Algermissen had declared: "All parts of this material world, as they went forth from the creative hand of God, were good. There is no such thing as matter that is evil by nature."³⁴ But now he speaks of the *natural goals of the sensual appetites*. Whatever he may mean, he reminds us of the fact that Rome, contrary to Gen. 1:31: "God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good," contrasts man's body and spirit in his original state as two opposite principles. Rome has a long heritage of philosophy to reconcile, including Neo-Platonism, and therefore at times finds herself in trouble. That was true at Trent; it is still so today.

To understand Rome's atomistic approach to actual sin, it is necessary to keep in mind what the Council of Trent said about concupiscence. The Fathers declared: "This concupiscence, which the apostle sometimes calls sin (Rom. 6—8), the holy Synod declares that the Catholic Church has never understood it to be called sin, as being truly and properly sin

³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 330.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 417.

³² *Op. cit.*, p. 415.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 403.

in those born again, but because it is of sin, and inclines to sin."³⁵ Luther, on the contrary, called it the essential sin which does not sin for an hour or for a certain time, but wherever and as long as the person is.³⁶ If evil inclination itself is no sin, then the sinner need only count up the sins of act to determine his moral status before God, and after an inventory it should be equally possible to balance the sinful acts with an equivalent number of good deeds. Father Cassilly defines a sin as an offense against God, which may be committed by any willful thought, word, deed, or omission against the law of God; it is the sin which one commits himself.³⁷ The emphasis is on the word "willful." The division of actual sins into sins in thought, word, and deed, and sins of omission is correct; not so is Rome's division of sins into mortal and venial. Mortal sin is defined as a grievous offense against God, which deprives the soul of sanctifying grace. Venial sin is a lesser offense against God, which need not be confessed, but may be forgiven in Holy Communion, or by prayer or good works, provided one no longer has any affection for it.³⁸ Faerber tells the children in his catechism that "he commits sin who knowingly and willfully transgresses a divine commandment."³⁹ Girardey explains: "There is a great difference in sins, for instance: between a little blow and a murder, between stealing a nickel and stealing \$1,000. One sin is light or venial, and the other grievous." It appears that it is quite within the limits of possibility for sin to fluctuate with the stock market or the value of the currency.

No matter how sin may be defined and divided, Rome finds that man is still a sinner and must do something about it to square himself with God. This raises the question of justification. The Tridentine Fathers had considerable difficulty reaching an agreement on terms. Session VI summarizes the results of their debates. It treats of the preparation for justification; of justification itself; and of the fruit of justification, or the merit of good works. The Council demon-

³⁵ Session V, 5.

³⁶ *Saemmtliche Schriften* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1882), XI: 287.

³⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 37-41.

³⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

strated its ability to combine conflicting theories by joining those of the Scotists and Thomists, stating that man consenting to the work of God and working with Him *prepares himself* for justification (Scotist view); at the same time the process of justification receives its first impulse, *independent of man's merit*, from the *gratia praeveniens*, the supernatural grace of vocation (Thomist view). Justification, then, is not a forensic act, by which God declares a believer in Christ as the Savior free from the guilt of sin and as righteous in His sight, but a process within man by which God makes the sinner just and holy. Good works, says the Council of Trent, are not merely the fruits and signs of justification, but are truly meritorious. The Fathers at Trent declared: "If any one saith, that justifying faith is nothing else but confidence in the divine mercy which remits sins for Christ's sake; or, that this confidence alone is that whereby we are justified; let him be anathema."⁴⁰ And regarding works: "If any one saith, that the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works; but that said works are merely the fruits and signs of Justification obtained, but not a cause of the increase thereof; let him be anathema."⁴¹ Joseph Pohle defines the principal object of Christ's meritorious actions as the justification of sinners. He states: "It is an article of faith that our Divine Saviour merited for us the forgiveness of all sins, including original sin, and, in addition, sanctifying grace."⁴² The words "sanctifying grace" show that Pohle has not improved on the Fathers at Trent, for he continues: "That the actual graces required for and during the *process* of justification also flow from the thesaurus of Christ's merits, is a theologically certain conclusion." So justification is not a forensic act, God declaring the world justified for the sake of the active and passive obedience of His Son, but a process. Pohle declares: "The privilege of participating in the merits of Christ's vicarious atonement does not relieve us of the duty of personally atoning for our sins. That Christ has rendered adequate satisfaction for the sins of the whole race, does not mean that each individual human being is *eo*

⁴⁰ Session VI, Canon XII.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, Canon XXIV.

⁴² Joseph Pohle, *Soteriology* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1933), page 58.

ipso subjectively redeemed. This is the teaching of 'orthodox' Lutheranism [sic!], not of the Catholic Church. We Catholics believe that the individual sinner must feel sorry for his sins, confess them, and render satisfaction for them — though, of course, no satisfaction can be of any avail except it is based on the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."⁴³ Rome still today rejects the chief article of Christian doctrine, "that we receive forgiveness of sins and are justified before God, not by our works, but by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith." Just what has the Savior, then, according to Rome, accomplished by His life, suffering, and death on earth? He has atoned for original sin, removed eternal guilt, and merited for the sinner that sanctifying grace whereby the latter may now save himself by his own good works.

To the Catholic it sounds quite proper when Father Ostheimer intimates that abstinence from eating meat on Friday is making some little sacrifice for our sins.⁴⁴ The sister superior was true to her Romanist conviction when she replied to the sainted Pastor Fr. Brust, who had complimented the new Catholic hospital at Boonville, Mo., on its fine appointments: "Es kostet aber auch 'was, in den Himmel zu kommen!" The Paulist Press has put out a tract containing some of the "Wise and Loving Counsels" by St. Francis de Sales, who died Dec. 28, 1622. By publishing the following counsel, taken from St. Francis' *Conversations*, the Paulist editor gives it the present-day stamp of approval. St. Francis said: "Many persons are tormented at death with the remembrance of their crimes, and seeing that they have done no penance, they are tempted to despair. 'Oh, if I had fasted! Oh, if I had performed great charities for the poor! Alas, I am no longer in a state to perform them! What will become of me? What shall I do?' You can do something greater than all you have mentioned, namely, to accept death and unite it with that of Jesus Christ. There is no mortification comparable to this; it is the deepest humiliation, the greatest impoverishment, the most terrible penance. And I do not at all doubt, but that he who is grieved for having offended God and who accepts death willingly, in satisfaction for his sins, will immediately obtain

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 40—41.

⁴⁴ Anthony L. Ostheimer, *Instructions for Non-Catholics Before Marriage* (Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press), p. 174.

pardon. What a consolation to be able to perform, while dying, a greater penance than all the anchorets have been able to perform in deserts, and this at a time when one would seem no longer able to do anything! Why waste so advantageous an occasion of honoring God, satisfying His justice, discharging one's debts, and purchasing Heaven? — "Any comments are quite superfluous.

Regarding the scope of Christ's redemptive work the Tridentine Fathers correctly stated: "Him [Christ] God hath *proposed* as a propitiator, *through faith in his blood, for our sins, and not for our sins only, but also for those of the whole world.*"⁴⁵ Pohle quotes these words in support of his thesis: "Christ died for all men without exception."⁴⁶ "The doctrine of the universality of the atonement," he states, "is not disproved by the fact that many human beings are eternally lost."⁴⁷ In support of this he quotes the Council of Trent, which teaches: "But though He died for all, yet not all receive the benefit of His death, but those only unto whom the merit of His Passion is communicated."⁴⁸ Pohle correctly points out that it is indeed quite obvious that if a man neglects to appropriate the fruits of the redemption, he derives no more benefit therefrom than one who is dying of thirst receives from a spring within his reach but from which he refuses to drink. Quoting Thomas Aquinas on this point, he concludes: "The atonement is universal only with regard to its objective application or efficaciousness."⁴⁹ What Christ has merited for the sinner and the latter must regain for himself, says Rome, is the supernatural image of God, which consists in sanctifying grace, exemption from concupiscence, and immortality — all of which Adam lost for himself and his descendants when he fell. The important question which remains is: By what means may the sinner regain these things? Rome answers: By means of the sacraments, which are visible signs imparting to the recipient invisible grace. "Two of the sacraments — baptism and penance — confer sanctifying grace; the former imparts it to those who have never before possessed it, and the latter to those who have lost it. The other five sacraments increase sanctifying grace."⁵⁰ The validity of the

⁴⁵ Session VI, Chapter II.

⁴⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 77—78.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁴⁸ Session VI, 3.

⁴⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 82—83.

⁵⁰ Girardey, *op. cit.*, p. 301.

sacraments does not depend on the faith of the recipient, since they have power to produce their effects *ex opere operato*, that is, by a virtue inherent in themselves. The Tridentine Fathers declare: "If any one saith, that by the said sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the act performed (*ex opere operato*), but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace; let him be anathema."⁵¹ "It is to be noted," says Father Cassilly, "that the sacraments, according to the institution of Christ, give grace of themselves."⁵² Still the *ex opere operato*!

"In addition to the conferring or increasing of sanctifying grace, each sacrament gives the right or title to certain *actual graces* which are necessary for the proper effect of that sacrament. Thus holy orders confer on the priest the graces which are necessary to fulfill his priestly duties," says Father Cassilly.⁵³ The way to heaven, to the beatific vision of God, is the sacramental way; this way is in the hands of the priests. There are only a few exceptions. Baptism, for instance, may be performed by a layman. The sacramental plus the sacerdotal system gives the priest his tremendous hold on the laity. Father Cassilly states: "The principal powers of the priest are to offer the Holy Sacrifice [in the mass] and to forgive sins."⁵⁴ The medieval power of the interdict is largely a thing of the past — the popes wore it out; but the threat of excommunication is still a force to be reckoned with. Only the priest can perform the sacrifice of the mass, by which Christ, according to Rome, is repeatedly offered for the actual sins of the living and the dead. Only the priest can ordinarily absolve from mortal sin in the sacrament of penance, that second plank for those who have suffered spiritual shipwreck after baptism. Only the priest can ordinarily legitimize marriage. Only he can help the dying person across the bar in the sacrament of extreme unction. Rome has lost no means of controlling the individual member of her body.

This fact has far-reaching political implication. For Rome the Church is a kingdom of this world with a complete system of rulers — all under the all-powerful and infallible pope as the supreme potentate. The sacramental system — not to overlook the confessional box — gives her an internal solidar-

⁵¹ Session VII, Canon VIII.

⁵² *Op. cit.*, p. 179.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

ity for which any other totalitarian state might envy her. This solidarity gives her a measure of political power even in Protestant countries quite in excess of her numerical strength. History recounts Rome's political ambitions on pages penned with blood. In her political aspirations Rome is also still the same. The celibate clerics, finding prestige and security only in the Church to which they have been pledged, constitute a dependable force for political machinations. The laudable expressions of outstanding American Catholics on the separation of Church and State do not reflect the official position of Rome on that question. To disarm the fears of the non-Catholic, Father Ostheimer declares: "If the Pope were to command Catholics to be disloyal to their lawfully constituted civil authorities, we would not be bound to obey him. As Cardinal Gibbons wrote: 'The Pope will take no such action . . . even though it is part of the Catholic Faith that he is infallible in the exercises of his teaching authority; but were he to do so, he would stand self-condemned, a transgressor of the law he himself promulgates.'"⁵⁵ Father Ostheimer names a number of Catholics who rendered outstanding service to America. He could have increased the number many times. No one who knows the history of our country will deny that splendid men and women of the Roman Catholic Church have made admirable contributions to America. The question is not how many good or bad citizens this Church has contributed to America, but what Rome's official attitude is towards the separation of Church and State and the great freedoms for which men have been willing to die: freedom of speech, of the press, of religion. Cardinal Gibbons denied that the pope would command Catholics to be disloyal to their lawfully constituted civil authorities, adding: "Were he to do so, he would stand self-condemned, a transgressor of the law he himself promulgates." We may ask: Which law is that? History must stand aghast at the Cardinal's presumption on American credulity. In view of the record, one feels an impulse to cry out: *O si tacuisses!* Down through the centuries it has been one of the papal weapons to absolve subjects from their allegiance to rulers who were at odds with the papacy. Some classic examples are Henry IV, who came to Canossa, and John Lackland, not to mention Philip Augustus, Frederic II

⁵⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 185.

of the Holy Roman Empire, and an array of others. The political claims of Gregory VII and of Innocent III have never been retracted, though since the days of Boniface VIII they have lost some of their potency. In the *Syllabus* Pius IX (d. 1878) asserted: The Church has power to use force (24); kings and princes are under the jurisdiction of the Church and subject to it in litigated questions of jurisdiction (54); the Church is not to be separated from the State nor the State from the Church (55); the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State to the exclusion of all other forms of worship (77); hence it was not well that in some parts of the Catholic world immigrants should be allowed the public practice of any form of worship whatever (78).⁵⁶ Father F. Cavalli, S. J., writing on the conditions of the Protestants in Spain in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, an official organ of the Society of Jesus, presents the official position of Rome in matters of Church and State. It would be difficult to improve on his wording for clarity. Father Cavalli states: "The Roman Catholic Church, convinced, through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true Church, must demand the right of freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the Church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that by legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the Church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only *de facto* existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs. If, however, actual circumstances, either due to government hostility or the strength of the dissenting groups, make the complete application of the principle impossible, then the (Catholic) Church will require for herself all possible concessions, limiting herself to accept, as a minor evil, the *de jure* toleration of other forms of worship. In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabitate where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the Church does not renounce her thesis, which remains the most imperative of her laws, but merely adapts herself to *de facto* conditions, which must be

⁵⁶ Klotsche, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

taken into account in practical affairs. Hence arises the great scandal among Protestants, who tax the Catholics with refusing to others freedom and even *de jure* toleration in all places where they are in the majority, while they lay claim to it as a right when they are in a minority. . . . We ask Protestants to understand that the Catholic Church would betray her trust if she were to proclaim, theoretically and practically, that error can have the same rights as truth, especially where the supreme duties and interest of man are at stake. The Church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice."⁵⁷

In another area Rome is still the same, namely: in her worship of angels and the saints, images, relics; in making meritorious pilgrimages, praying for the dead, and granting indulgences. Indeed, as long as Rome anathematizes justification by faith alone, her devotion to these things can be comprehended. They will thrive on her false doctrine of work-righteousness like fungi on a decayed tree. If Christ is regarded as a judge rather than as the Redeemer, the invention of other mediators to plead with Him for mercy can be understood. When Sinai flashed with lightning and quaked before the holiness of God, Israel pleaded with Moses to intercede for them. So in Rome's legalistic religion the saints are invoked to plead for God's mercy, and Mary, the blessed mother of Christ, is called upon rather than her merciful Son, who said: "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. 11:28). Rome still has not learned the comforting significance of the Master's repeated promise: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you" (John 16:23). Rome still detracts attention from the only One who can hear prayer by directing her people to God's creatures — no matter how noble these may be — rather than to the Creator, to whom, because He hears prayer, all flesh shall come (Ps. 65:2).

Rome is ever the same. We thank God that in her midst the Holy Trinity is worshiped and Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Mary, is confessed as the Savior. Father Cassilly reminds Catholic pupils that in making the sign of

⁵⁷ *Christian Century*, June 23, 1948; reprinted in the *Lutheran Witness*, July 13, 1948.

the cross they call to mind the existence of God, the mystery of the Blessed Trinity and the incarnation and death of the Son of God. "The mention of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost," he says, "recalls the three Persons in God; the expression 'in the name,' not 'in the names,' shows that the three Persons are but one God; and the cross itself is a reminder that the Son of God became Man and died upon it for our salvation."⁵⁸ In the Roman Catholic Church there is doubtless a portion of the *una sancta ecclesia*, built not upon Peter alone or upon the pope, but "upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief Cornerstone" (Eph. 2:20). "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3:11). The saints who learned to know their Savior in the Catholic Church will join the throng of martyrs before the throne of the Lamb—the confessors who died for their faith in the Gospel under the bloody persecution of Rome's fanaticism. Rome is ever the same; but so is the Sword of the Spirit, God's Word, with which Luther met her threats and errors. Turning to the Bible, not to the decrees of councils or papal decisions, we hear Christ declare: "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31-32).

⁵⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 314.

Union Theses

Adopted by the Evangelical Lutheran Church
of Old Prussia (Breslau Synod)
and the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church
(Free Church of Saxony and Other States)*

I

CONCERNING THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

There is an inseparable union between the two bases of the Reformation, in fact, of the true Church of Christ, viz., between the doctrine that lost and condemned mankind can be saved solely by the grace of God for Christ's sake through faith (*sola gratia, sola fide*) and the principle that all teaching must be according to the Holy Scriptures (*sola Scriptura*). There can be no Christian proclamation without the proper distinction between Law and Gospel. There is no Christian proclamation unless the Christian doctrine is determined solely according to the Holy Scriptures and in no wise by human reason. The Law as well as the Gospel must be proclaimed as God's Word. If human judgment is permitted to determine what in the Holy Scriptures constitutes the Word of God, or if doctrine is derived from another source beside Holy Scripture, the authority of the proclamation is vitiated. Such a procedure will also lead to a denial of man's total depravity and to a complete or partial denial of the all-sufficient vicarious sacrifice of the incarnate Son of God, in short, to a denial of grace, and thus to a return to the doctrine of work-

* Immediately after the cessation of hostilities and under the terrific aftermath of the war, representatives of the two largest Lutheran Free Churches met in order to discuss the points of doctrine which had been at issue between these two churches for almost a century and to bring about under God's grace a God-pleasing union. A frank discussion in the fear of God led within the space of two years to a full agreement on all points. A committee consisting of Pastors Gerhard Heinzelmann (Breslau Synod) and W. M. Oesch (Saxon Free Church) drafted the union theses. These were submitted to all pastors and congregations and unanimously adopted by them. Full fellowship between the two church bodies has been established. At the present time doctrinal discussions between these two bodies and the remaining Lutheran Free Churches are under way.—We hope that the theses in their translated form will be a distinct service to our pastors. F. E. Mayer.

righteousness. We maintain unequivocally both Reformation principles, grace and Scripture. The fact that we discuss the latter first is not to be understood as though this were the manner to save souls, to quicken the spiritually dead, or to remove men's doubts. This can be effected solely when Law and Gospel prove themselves as God's Word upon the hearts of men. The Holy Spirit creates faith in the Scriptures through the written and spoken Word. In speaking of the divine authority of the Scriptures or the doctrine of plenary inspiration, we are not dealing with a theory, but with express statements of the Holy Spirit concerning the Scriptures.

1. *The divinely inspired Scriptures, that is, the original text of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, were written under God's gracious condescension by men endowed with specific gifts and powers at specific times, under specific conditions, and in so far share the same historical experiences as human books (Luke 1:1-4).*

This thesis wishes to state that the holy writers were not *calami* (pencils), as though their own psychic life had been extinguished. The mystery of God's condescension in the Scriptures, who does not use celestial language (2 Cor. 12:4), but speaks through men in human language (Heb. 1:1-2; 1 John 1:1-4; 1 Cor. 1:21, 25), cannot be explained.

2. *The Holy Scriptures are of divine origin and divine character, because God's Holy Spirit employed the writers and gave them the Scriptures by inspiration according to its content (Realinspiration) and according to its phraseology (Verbalinspiration) (Acts 2:4; 1 Cor. 2:13; Rom. 3:2; Matt. 22:43-45; Gal. 3:16; 1 Pet. 1:10-12; 2 Pet. 1:21; 2 Tim. 3:14-17; Trigl., Nicene Creed, p. 31; Augsburg Confession, p. 90, par. 49). The Scriptures not only contain the Word of God, as though men had the prerogative to determine what in the Scriptures is the Word of God and what is not the Word of God, but in its entirety it is God's irrevocable, infallible Word (unverbruechliches Wort) (John 17:17; Tit. 1:2-3; Trigl., 770:76), given for our salvation (John 1:17; 2 Cor. 3:8-9, Law and Gospel; John 5:39; 2 Tim. 3:15-17), the only source of truth (John 17:20; 1 Pet. 4:11 a; 1 Tim. 6:3-5; Trigl., 466:15; 850:3), "the only rule and norm according to which all doctrine and life must be judged" (Matt. 4:4, 7; Acts 17:11; 1 Cor. 14:37; 2 Tim. 1:13-14; Trigl., 776:1; 778:7). If there*

seem to be contradictions or errors in historical, scientific, or other areas, an attempt must be made to find a solution. If this is not possible, we must commit the entire matter to God and accept the authoritative position of the Scriptures even in these statements (John 10:35; Matt. 5:18; 19:4-5). Since God has spoken through Prophets and Apostles, and Scripture, therefore, in all its parts is God's Word, therefore content and form of Scripture, spirit and letter (*Trigl.*, 44:4; 494:3-6), dare never be torn asunder (John 1:14; Acts 1:16; 1 Thess. 2:13; John 6:63; Gal. 3:2).

Since Scripture is God's Word, it is the foundation of the Church (John 17:20; Eph. 2:20; Rom. 10:6-8) and the light which shines in a dark place (Ps. 119:105; 2 Pet. 1:19; *Trigl.*, 152:107-108).

The rule of faith, according to which Holy Scripture must be understood, are the clear passages of Scripture in which the respective doctrines are discussed (*sedes doctrinae*), not a humanly devised "totality of Scripture" (*Trigl.*, 440:60; Matt. 28:20 a; John 8:31-32; Matt. 4:7). Nothing dare be treated as an open question by the Church which has been revealed in clear Scripture passages. On the other hand, all those points on which Scripture has not spoken remain open questions, because the Church is built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. There is no warrant for the assumption that God has revealed or will reveal doctrines outside Scripture (Matt. 15:9; Rom. 16:17; Gal. 1:8; 5:9; Rev. 22:18-19). At the same time all Christians must search in God's Word and grow in Christian knowledge (2 Pet. 3:18). Difference of opinion in non-doctrinal questions — such as exegetical, historical, or other questions — are not church-divisive, so long as the principle of the inerrancy of Scripture is maintained (*im Glauben grundsatzlich festgehalten wird*). Faith in the doctrine of inspiration does not lead to a bondage of the letter, but prompts the childlike, humble, and confident prayer: "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth" (Ps. 119:38, 76, 152).

NOTE. — Thesis 1 definitely repudiates the misunderstanding which is frequently attached to the term "verbal inspiration," as though it were a mechanical dictation. The term "verbal inspiration" has not been used to explain the mystery of divine inspiration. It merely expresses the fact which

both Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions maintain, namely, the Word of the Scriptures is identical with God's Word (*Schriftwort ist gleich Gottes Wort*). The doctrine of inspiration understood in the sense that God not only illuminated the persons and revealed the facts but has also inspired the words, may also be expressed in the term "plenary inspiration." (Compare also *Trigl.*, 38:8; 56:1-2; 270:66; 318:13-17; 382:70-71; 412:89; 464:8; 494-496:3, 9-10; 504:6; 570:11; 850-856:5-19; 964-966:12-14; 1066:12.)

II

CONCERNING CONVERSION AND PREDESTINATION

A. CONCERNING CONVERSION

In the doctrine of conversion the Biblical concept of God's saving grace must be maintained in its full import. The grace of God rests solely upon the universal justification of the entire world in Christ (2 Cor. 5:19-21; Rom. 5:18), is God's gracious disposition toward the sinner for Christ's sake (Rom. 4:5). Scripture permits no one to doubt the earnestness of God's gracious will, for "God will have all men to be saved" (1 Tim. 2:4). The message of God's gracious will is the Gospel, which according to Christ's will is to be proclaimed among all nations (Acts 20:24 c; Matt. 28:19) and is so efficacious that it not only demands faith, but actually works faith (Rom. 1:16; 10:17; Gal. 3:2). And God's universal invitation is so serious that His wrath is provoked against all who do not accept His universal invitation (Luke 14:21; 2 Pet. 2:1 b).

1. *Conversion consists in this, that a sinner who has been smitten by God's Law and has learned to know himself as a condemned sinner, comes to faith in the Gospel, which on account of Christ's vicarious atonement offers to the sinner forgiveness of sins and eternal salvation* (Luke 24:47; Acts 26:18; 11:21). *Conversion is accomplished in the moment when the Holy Spirit engenders the first spark of faith or a yearning for saving grace* (*Trigl.*, 902:54; 884:14; 886:16). *According to Scripture, man since the Fall is dead in sin* (Eph. 2:1-3), *inclined toward all that is evil* (Gen. 8:21; Rom. 8:7), *considers the Gospel foolishness* (1 Cor. 2:14), *and is an enemy of God and His Gospel* (1 Cor. 1:23; *Trigl.*, 42, Art. II;

50, Art. XVIII, 1-4; 882:7). *Therefore conversion is in no wise the work of man, but exclusively the work of divine grace and God's "mighty power"* (1 Cor. 12:3 b; Phil. 1:29; Eph. 2:8; 1:19; Phil. 2:13; Jer. 31:18; *Trigl.*, 890:25). *Therefore the Scriptures speak of a "raising from the dead"* (Col. 2:12), a *"being born of God"* (John 1:12-13), *the new birth out of the Gospel* (1 Pet. 1:23), *an act of God similar to the creation of light on the first day of creation* (2 Cor. 4:6; *Trigl.*, 904:60).

Accordingly we reject gross synergism, which holds that man is only partially corrupt and can make the beginning of his conversion by his own latent powers, as well as all forms of synergism which ascribe to man the ability to prepare himself for grace (*Trigl.*, 882:7), or the ability to desist from his malicious resistance, so that man makes the final decision in his conversion, or the theory that man is able with "imparted gifts" to complete the work which the grace of God had begun in him. Neither Scripture nor the Confessions know of such human capacities. On the contrary, they testify that all glory must be given to God for the conversion of the sinner (Ps. 100:3; Rom. 9:16), and that man, prior to his conversion, has no good spiritual powers whatsoever by means of which he can rightly employ the (alleged) "imparted powers" and give the consenting word to God's grace (Eph. 2:1-6). We, therefore, reject the doctrine that there is an intermediate state between spiritual death and spiritual life; likewise also the distinction between "spiritual awakening," the imparted capacity to believe, and "conversion proper," the self-determination in which the sinner raises potential faith to actual faith (*zum Glauben durchdringt*). It must also be observed that the terms "to be converted" and "to convert one's self" are not two processes separate from one another in fact and in time, but one and the same act, namely, the one work of the Holy Spirit, who makes the unbelieving a believer (*Trigl.*, 890:24).

OBSERVATION: The daily repentance or conversion of the Christian must be distinguished from his first conversion. In his daily conversion the old Adam is drowned with all sins and evil lusts, and the new man comes forth who lives in righteousness and purity before God. In this process there is, of course, co-operation on the part of the regenerate Christian

(John 3:6 b; 15:5; Gal. 5:17; Rom. 8:13-14; Heb. 12:14; Small Catechism, Second Article), but only so that all glory must be ascribed to God, the Author and Finisher of our faith (Heb. 12:2; Phil. 2:12 b-13; 1 Cor. 1:29-31; Trigl., 906:65-66).

2. *The Holy Spirit performs His work not immediately, but through means, Word and Sacrament* (2 Cor. 3:6, 8). All men are, therefore, directed to the means of grace (Mark 1:15; Matt. 17:5; John 3:5; 1 Cor. 11:25; Trigl., 908:71-72). Though the call of the Gospel is in every instance serious and efficacious (*voll goettlicher Kraft*) (Rom. 1:16; 1:5), saving grace is not irresistible, nor is there coercion in conversion and preservation. That the majority of those called by the Gospel either do not come to faith or fall away again must be attributed to man's continued and malicious resistance and is man's own fault (Acts 7:51; Luke 13:34; Acts 13:46; Trigl., 834:12), never God's fault.

B. CONCERNING PREDESTINATION

There is an integral relation between the doctrines of predestination and conversion. Both presuppose the universality and all-sufficiency of grace. Though the doctrine of predestination occupies an ancillary position in the entire complex of Christian doctrine, it dare not be treated as a secondary and unimportant doctrine, because the entire comfort of the Gospel is contained in it.

1. *The universal, gracious will of God extends from eternity over all men as certainly as Christ, who bore the sins of the world* (John 1:29), *was foreordained before the foundation of the world* (1 Pet. 1:20) and as certainly as Christ died for all men upon the Cross (1 Tim. 2:6; 2 Pet. 2:1) and God in Christ has forgiven the sins of the world (2 Cor. 5:19; Rom. 5:18) and earnestly desires that through the preaching of the Gospel all men should be saved and brought to the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. 2:4-6; 2 Pet. 3:9; Trigl., 1070 f.:28-29).

According to this thesis God's gracious will is both universal and serious, and it is therefore blasphemous to teach that Christ did not die for all men and that God passed by the greater part of mankind or even predetermined the majority to damnation, or that His gracious call is serious only in the case of the elect. The reason why many are lost

does not lie in God, but in man "who would not" (Matt. 23: 37; *Trigl.*, 836:16-21).

2. *God's gracious decree of election deals only with the believers. Based upon the eternal decree of universal redemption and serving it (Rom. 8: 32-24), unconditioned by any act of unregenerate or regenerate man (2 Tim. 1: 9), the gracious decree of election is "a cause of their salvation, which He also provides as well as disposes what belongs thereto. Upon this our salvation is founded so firmly that the gates of hell cannot overcome it" (Trigl., 833: 5). Predestination is that act of God by which He in Christ and in sanctification of the Spirit and in faith of the truth has before time elected the believers out of the mass of others (Rom. 8: 26-30; Eph. 1: 3-6; 2 Thess. 2: 13-14; Trigl., 1068: 23).*

Scripture states that those who attain eternal salvation owe this solely to the grace of God in Christ, more specifically, to "His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began" (2 Tim. 1: 9), and in no wise to themselves. Like Paul, they ascribe the many spiritual blessings in heavenly places which they now enjoy in faith to the election in Christ before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1: 3-4; Acts 13: 48; *Trigl.*, 1064—1072: 9-33). The doctrine of predestination gives me the most certain hope that my salvation does not rest in my weak hands, but in the mighty and faithful hand of God (*Trigl.*, 1070: 25-26; 1078: 45-50).

The election does not take place outside Christ, as though there were two wills in God, a universal gracious will and a special will to save (*Heilswille*). The election has taken place in Christ, that is, Christ's work and merit and man's acceptance of the same according to the order of salvation are included in the decree of election. The acceptance of salvation is wrought by the Holy Spirit through the means of grace, Word, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, to which all men are directed (*Trigl.*, 1082: 65; 1086—1088: 76-77). It is Scriptural to say that election took place "in" or "through faith" (2 Thess. 2: 13); however, the phrase that it occurred "in view of final faith" must be avoided since it creates the impression as though our faith must be viewed as a contributing factor and thus as a cause of God's predestination (2 Tim. 1: 9; John 15: 16; *Trigl.*, 1092: 88).

3. *The question why God, in spite of the total depravity*

of all men and the universality of His grace, creates faith in some and not in others (cur alii, alii non?) remains an insoluble divine mystery. We must abide by the absolute either/or: It is man's own fault if he is lost, and it is God's grace alone if he is saved. (Trigl., 1078—1080: 52-56; 1088: 79-82.)

This thesis emphasizes the fact that our reason must here keep silence. The question will always remain: If salvation is solely God's work, then why does the almighty and gracious God remove the natural hostility over against the Gospel in the one and not in the other? Whoever attempts to solve this problem must either, as the Calvinists, make God the Author of the damnation of the reprobate, ascribe to Him an eternal decree of reprobation, of which Scripture knows nothing, and thereby deny universal grace; or he must ascribe the cause of man's salvation, as the synergists do, at least in part, to man's conduct, and thus deny the *sola gratia*. We must be satisfied with God's revelation both in the Law regarding man's guilt and in the Gospel regarding man's salvation. (Trigl., 1092: 89-90.)

III

CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

A. CONCERNING THE CHURCH

It is of paramount importance that the truly spiritual and evangelical nature and essence of the Church be maintained, which distinguishes Christ's kingdom from all the kingdoms of the world. Unless this is observed, the body of Christ, which has been brought into being by God's Spirit, will be transformed into a human organism with human traditions; the congregation of God will be changed into a society founded, organized, and governed by men; and the people of the Gospel gladly and willingly serving the Lord in the righteousness of faith will be transmuted into a people of the Law which vainly labors with dead works.

1. *The Church in the proper sense, or the one holy Christian Church, to which Christ originally committed all spiritual powers, are the saints or the believers, which have been called out of lost mankind and have been incorporated into Christ by Word and Sacrament (Acts 2:41, 47; 5:14; Eph. 1:23; 4:3-6; 5:25-27; Heb. 12:23; 1 Pet. 1:23; James 1:18;*

Gal. 4:26, 28; 1 Pet. 2:9; Matt. 16:15-19; 18:15-20; Small Catechism, Third Article; *Trigl.*, 498:XII; 230:12, 16; 900:50; 154:119-120; 510:24; 522:67-69).

This thesis emphasizes the truth that though the true Christians are known only to God and the true essence of the Church is hidden and invisible (Luke 17:20-21; 2 Tim. 2:19 a; Small Catechism, Third Article; *Trigl.*, 228—232:9-11, 13-15, 17-20), the Church nevertheless is perceptible by certain marks, namely, Word and Sacrament, by which the Church has been established (Augsburg Confession V). Ordinarily God will not convey faith nor deal with us except through the external Word and Sacrament (*Trigl.*, 494:3, 10). Although the Church is everywhere where the Gospel is still essentially in use, yet we are to seek the Church only there (*wir sollen die Kirche nur bei denen suchen*) where the ministry of the Word has been established, where the Gospel is purely taught and the Sacraments administered according to Christ's institution.† Wherever this is done, there the Church is truly to be found, since God's Word is never without fruit (Is. 55:10-11; Luke 8:8; 2 Cor. 2:15-16; *Trigl.*, 226:5; 228:7-8; 232:21-22; 314:26-28). The efficacy of the Gospel and the Sacraments is not dependent on the personal faith or piety of those who administer them, but the ascended Christ Himself builds and preserves the Church through the Word (Matt. 28:20 b; Eph. 4:16 a; *Trigl.*, 46:VII, VIII; 234 f.:28).

2 a. *In an improper sense the totality of the called may be designated as Church* (visible church, local congregation = *ecclesia simplex*, Matt. 18:17; Acts 8:1; 11:22; denominational bodies = *ecclesiae compositae*, 1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:1; 8:1, 19, 23), among whom also such will be found as use the means of grace only externally, without coming to faith (Matt. 13:47-48).

† The meaning of the phrase "die Kirche suchen" is not clear. Does the thesis wish to state that we must seek *fellowship* only where the Gospel is purely taught? Then the statement should be transferred to Paragraph 3. Or is the statement based on a false interpretation of Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, which states that in the *una sancta* "the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered"? A careful analysis of Article VII of the Augsburg Confession shows that no more is meant than that the Gospel must be "essentially in use," and not, that the Church is to be found only where the Gospel is preached in *all* its truth and purity. The sentence placed into this thesis is apt to lead to a confusion of the *una sancta* and the so-called visible Church. (F. E. M.)

This thesis indicates that hypocrites and nominal Christians cannot claim membership in the true Church on the basis of their external membership (Eph. 2:19-22; 1:1; Col. 1:2; 2 Tim. 2:19; 1 Cor. 5:13). Though Scripture frequently includes them under the term "church," yet this is done figuratively, inasmuch as synecdochically the whole bears the name of the essential part, because a clear-cut distinction between believers and hypocrites is impossible here on earth (Matt. 13:27-30; *Trigl.*, 226-228:3, 5-7; 230:12-13; 230-232:16-19; 232:20-21).

2 b. *The office of the keys, namely, the power to preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments and exercise pastoral discipline* (Matt. 28:18-20) *has been given originally and immediately to the Church in the proper sense* (Gal. 4:26, 28; 1 Pet. 2:9; Matt. 16:15-19; 18:15-20; *Trigl.*, 510:24; 522:67-69). *Of course, this power can be exercised only within the so-called visible Church* (Matt. 18:17; *Trigl.*, 692:54-55). *At the same time it delimits (umgrenzt) the scope of the Church's commission* (John 18:36-37; 20:21-23; 1 Tim. 3:15; Small Catechism, Office of the Keys I; *Trigl.*, 84:5-29).

This thesis is to set forth that the visible Church (*Gemeinde der Berufenen*) has no other function but the aforementioned truly ecclesiastical functions, viz., to preach the Law and Gospel for the salvation of immortal souls (Matt. 28:18-20; John 18:36-37; 20:21-23; 1 Tim. 3:15; Small Catechism, Office of the Keys I) and to establish truly Christian congregations (Romans 12; Revelation 2 and 3).

2 c. *Since Christ is the only Head of His one Church* (Eph. 1:22-23; 4:3-16; Large Catechism, Third Article; *Trigl.*, 690:51-53; 470:IV, 1), *therefore the organized Church must see to it that all ordinances and activities are subject to the sole authority of Christ in His Word* (John 18:37; Matt. 28:20; Eph. 2:20; John 17:20; 1 Pet. 4:11 a; 1 Tim. 6:3-5; Matt. 15:9; Rom. 16:17; Gal. 1:8; 5:9; Rev. 22:18-19; *Trigl.*, 776:1; 778:7; 46:2-4; 472:9). *All Church activities (Lebensausserung) of the visible Church must emanate from the confession and must manifest themselves as the immediate or mediate effect of Word and Sacraments* (Matt. 16:13-19; John 6:67-69; Heb. 10:23-25; Acts 2:42; 2 Corinthians 8 and 9; *Trigl.*, 510:25-27; 1054—1056:10-12).

The proper form of the historical Church, therefore, is that confessional Church which in unity of mind and unswerving loyalty preserves and continues the saving truth in the power of the Holy Spirit (Rev. 3:7-11; 1 Tim. 6:13-14; 2 Tim. 2:2; *Trigl.*, 42:I, 1). For that reason truly Christian congregations subscribe to the Lutheran Confessions as contained in the Book of Concord of 1580 as the correct interpretation and presentation of the divine Word (*Trigl.*, 776:3; 850:5). They are not a rule of faith outside and beyond Holy Scripture, but a confession of Scripture doctrine in the face of heresies. The doctrinal positions are binding upon the conscience, because they are doctrinal statements of Holy Scripture itself (*Trigl.*, 778:7). All who desire the public ministry in an orthodox church must subscribe the Confessions with *quia*, not with *quatenus* (*Trigl.*, 854:10). This doctrinal pledge covers all doctrines in the symbols, because they are taken from the Scriptures and therefore constitute an integrated whole. However, they do not cover such historical statements or purely exegetical questions (*auslegungswissenschaftlich*) and other matters as have no bearing on the doctrinal content (*Trigl.*, 1062:31).

The true confessional spirit implies that (on the one hand) the Church of Christ will not surrender the cause of Christ and her liberty as the bride of Christ to any secular encroachment, nor (on the other hand) does the Church usurp purely civic or political functions. While according to the will of God the Church must exert a wholesome moral influence on society — also through proclaiming the revealed Law, which is applicable to all vocations — nevertheless it would be wrong to argue that the Church is a segment of the world and therefore as a Church has civic duties, rights, and functions. This is a distorted notion of the essence and purpose of Christ's Church on earth similar to the Roman and Calvinistic errors. (Matt. 20:25-28; Luke 12:13-14; 1 Cor. 2:2; 5:9-13; Small Catechism, Third Article; *Trigl.*, 50:4-7; 330—332:58-60.)

3. *The Word of God and the holy Sacraments — the seed and foundation* (1 Pet. 1:23; Eph. 2:20) *and only commission of the Church — are the marks of the Holy Christian (Kirche ueberhaupt) Church and, when preached in their truth and purity, the marks of the true visible or orthodox Church* (John 8:31; 1 Tim. 3:15; *Trigl.*, 46:VII).

This thesis states that the Church is to be found wherever Word and Sacrament are essentially present (Is. 55:10-11; Luke 8:8; 2 Cor. 2:15-16; 1 Cor. 3:11-13; Rom. 9:6 a; 11:4-6). It, however, also emphasizes that we can adhere to it [the *una sancta*? F. E. M.] with a good conscience only there (*dass ich mich aber nur da mit gutem Gewissen zu ihr halten kann, wo*) where Word and Sacrament are used in their truth and purity (John 8:31-32; 1 Cor. 1:10; John 17:20; 1 Pet. 4:11 a; 1 Tim. 6:3-5; Matt. 15:9; Rom. 16:17; Gal. 1:8; 5:9; Rev. 22:18-19; *Trigl.*, 46:VII; 1062:31); that we must co-operate in word and deed with an orthodox communion (Phil. 1:5; Gal. 6:6; 1 Cor. 15:58) and avoid all heterodox communions (Matt. 7:15; Rom. 16:17; 2 John 10-11; 2 Cor. 6:14-18; *Trigl.*, 86:22-28; 242:47-48; 828-830:6-7; 42:5-6; 102:2 b; 514-516:38, 41-42; 518-520:52, 57-59; 474:10-14; 512-518:31-53; 520:57-59; 226:4; 318:18-19; 46:X; 804:11; 806-808:1-5; 814-816:25-39; 816:1-3; 822:23-26; 824-826:30-39; Augsburg Confession XVI, XVII; 838-842:XII). The orthodoxy of a church is not determined by its name nor the external and nominal subscription to an orthodox confession, but by the doctrine which is *de facto* proclaimed in the pulpit, in the theological schools, in the publications (Second Commandment, First Petition). At the same time it must be observed that a church does not lose its orthodox character through the casual intrusion of heresy, as long as the church opposes and removes such heresy by doctrinal discipline (Acts 20:30; 1 Tim. 1:3; Tit. 1:9-11; *Trigl.*, 24).—Every form of unionism, that is, every church fellowship with errorists as well as interdenominational unionism, that is, a church fellowship between orthodox and heterodox churches, is contrary to Scripture and the Confessions (Tit. 3:10; John 8:31-32; 1 Cor. 1:10; Matt. 7:15; Rom. 16:17; 2 John 10-11; 2 Cor. 6:14-18; *Trigl.*, 854-56:14-16; 1094:95; 1094-96:4:6), disrupts the Church of Christ, and exposes to the ever-present danger of losing the Word of God completely (1 Tim. 6:3-5; 2 Tim. 2:17-21; Gal. 5:9). By strict adherence to the Word we must foster the unity of the Church here on earth until we behold it in eternity (John 17:14, 17, 20-21).‡

‡ Does not the last part of v. 21 indicate that the unity is to be visible also in this world? (F. E. M.)

B. CONCERNING THE PUBLIC MINISTRY

1. *The holy ministry is an office instituted by Christ and is a ministry of service. The Lord has commanded the Church to establish this office, to which the Church is bound until the end of days* (Luke 6:13; Matt. 28:19-20; 2 Cor. 5:18-20; Tit. 1:5; Trigl., 504:10).

On the one hand, the office of the ministry is not a peculiar state, one distinct from, and superior to, the state of all Christians, nor a self-perpetuating state (Trigl., 522—524:69). On the other hand, the office of the ministry is not a mere human ordinance subject to human caprice (*menschlicher Willkuer unterworfen*).

2. *Although the office to remit and to retain sin, to preach Law and Gospel, was originally and immediately given all Christians by the Lord of the Church* (Matt. 16:15-19; John 20:19-23; Luke 24:33-36; Trigl., 510:24), *nevertheless, in order properly to exercise this office publicly, the congregation calls a qualified person for this purpose* (Rom. 10:15; Acts 1:23-26; 6:3-6; 1 Tim. 3:1-7; Augsburg Confession XIV). *The person so called feeds the congregation with and rules it through Word and Sacrament* (John 20:22-23; Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:1-3; Heb. 13:12), *not only by human authority, but at the same time — and therefore mediately — by the command of the Lord* (Matt. 28:20; Luke 10:16; 1 Cor. 4:1). *Ordination is the solemn confirmation before the congregation of the call into the holy ministry* (Acts 13:3; 6:6; Trigl., 522—524:67-70).

3. *Since the Church is one under its Head, Christ, it is the solemn duty of the congregation, though each congregation is the Church* (Matt. 18:17, 20; 1 Cor. 3:21-23; Trigl., 501:24; 522:66-67; 828:4), *to foster the unity of the Spirit with the entire orthodox Church* (Eph. 4:3-16; Rom. 15:5-7) *and wherever possible to build jointly with other congregations the entire Church of Christ* (1 Cor. 12:4-13, 26-28; Acts 11:21-23; 2 Cor. 11:8; Amos 6:6). *Such co-operation presupposes proper guidance and direction* (*gemeinschaftliche Leitung*) *because the Lord has commanded that everything be done decently and in order* (1 Cor. 14:40; 2 Cor. 8:18-21; 9:5). *But in such joint activity the spiritual feeding and guiding must always remain the function of the public ministry as the real* (*eigentliches*) *and highest office in the Church* (2 Cor. 5:18;

Trigl., 326:44; 472:9). *Regulations for the offices necessary to carry out the joint functions may vary from time to time. All external arrangements in congregations and in church bodies and all ranking of the ministers are purely of human right* (Matt. 23:8; 1 Cor. 3:21-23).

IV. OF THE LAST THINGS

Article XVII of the Augsburg Confession, in condemning "certain Jewish opinions," indicates the type of eschatology which dare not have a place in the Lutheran Church. It is essential that our Christian hope be not corrupted and that we do not lose sight of our goal by false human concepts of the eternal kingdom of Christ, as was the case in the Messianic hopes of the Jews. In the final analysis the question concerns the spiritual character of Christ's kingdom in distinction from all secular kingdoms (Gal. 4:31) and the Gospel, which does not promise earthly joy and honor before the world, but spiritual, heavenly, and eternal blessings (1 Cor. 15:19; Eph. 1:3).

1. *We subscribe without qualification Article XVII, 1-3, of the Augsburg Confession (Trigl., 50). According to this thesis, Chiliasm is rejected, that is, the teaching of a twofold return of Christ, a twofold physical resurrection, and the view that prior to the resurrection the godly shall take possession of the kingdom of the world. This is contrary to Matt. 24:29-30; etc. (Cp. also 2 Tim. 4:1; John 6:39-40; Luke 17:20-21; 1 Cor. 13:9-12; Col. 3:1-4; Luke 9:22-24; John 15:18-19; John 16:33; 2 Tim. 3:1.)*

Revelation 20 cannot be adduced as an independent source for Christian doctrine, because it uses figurative language. It dare not be misused to darken other clear passages dealing with eschatology or the kingdom of Christ. Revelation 20 must be explained according to the clear passages with careful consideration of text and context. Though some would place the "thousand years" into the future and not into the past, yet they dare not find in the "thousand years" a teaching which is contrary to the analogy of faith and the consensus of Christian doctrine or which would fix the date of Judgment Day.

2. *The hope that Israel as a nation will return in the*

"latter days" to Palestine and be reinstated as the chosen people of the Old Testament is crass Chiliasm. This error must be repudiated, not because of racial or political anti-Semitism, but because it is contrary to Scripture and the correct doctrine of Christ's kingdom (Luke 17:20-21; 1 Thess. 2:16; Rom. 11:7). The hope that before Judgment all Jews will be converted is based on misinterpretation of Scripture, especially of the Old Testament, and on carnal views concerning conversion and Christ's kingdom (Rom. 11:25-28; Jer. 31:31-34; cp. Matt. 26:28 and Heb. 8:6-13; 10:14-18; 2 Thess. 3:2 b; cp. 2 Cor. 2:15-16). The view held by many that a large number of Jews will be converted during the last times is in itself not contrary to Scripture, but cannot be supported by clear Scripture passages. — It must always be maintained that a nation is never accepted of God because of its ancestry or national characteristics or by means of an external mass revivalism (*mittelst aeusserlicher Masseneinwirkung*), because this is contrary to the Gospel, i. e., the doctrine of justification by faith through grace, and in accord with the legalistic character of all heresy, which externalizes the kingdom of Christ (*das Reich Christi an das Wesen dieser Welt bindet*) (Gal. 4:26).

On the basis of Acts 15:15-28, compared with Amos 9:11, we agree with Luther that Rom. 11:25-28 and similar passages are fulfilled if "at all times some Jews are converted." In spite of the judgment of obduracy resting upon the majority of Israel, the number of those Jews who are to come to true faith and be won for Christ will be accomplished, even as the "fullness of the Gentiles shall come in." "All Israel" may mean the total number of the elect in Israel or the total number of all elect, "the Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16), not, however, all Israel according to the flesh (Luther's commentary on Isaiah 59:20-21; 44:5).

3. We subscribe to the statement in the Smalcald Articles (Trigl., 472—474), that the Pope is the very Antichrist, because he sits in the temple of God and acts as though he were God (2 Thessalonians 2), because he has condemned the heart of the Gospel, namely, the doctrine of the forgiveness of sin by grace alone for Christ's sake through faith without any merit or worthiness on our part, and because he recognizes as servants of the Christian Church only those who uncon-

ditionally subject themselves to him (Trigl., 474:10-14; 512—518:31-53; 520:57-59; 226:4; 318—320:18-19).

This thesis does not deny that there are many antichrists outside of the Papacy (1 John 2:18), nor that among the members of the Church of the Papacy there are true Christians. Nor is this thesis directed against the Pope as an individual person, but against the Papacy as an institution, and therefore against its representatives. Scripture teaches that the "man of sin" (*grosse Antichrist*) will remain until Judgment Day (2 Thess. 2:8) and for that reason all Christians must constantly be on their guard against his heresies (2 Thess. 2:9-12). In what manner the Papacy as the prototype and spearhead (*Vormacht*), in whom all the anti-Christian elements are typified and concentrated, will unite himself with other antichrists prior to Judgment Day is not revealed in clear Scripture passages. Speculations on this point do not affect the unity of Christian doctrine. For the teaching that the Pope is the Antichrist does not belong to the fundamental articles necessary to salvation.

The Christian doctrine of eschatology is closely related to the doctrines of Law and Gospel and is therefore of great significance for the Christians, as is apparent from Matthew 25 and 1 Corinthians 15. It is imperative that in eschatology we adhere closely to the words of Scripture over against all fantastic interpretations of prophetic passages, particularly prophecies of the Old Testament and of Revelation. We must deal only with clear Scripture passages, interpret Scripture with Scripture, read the Old Testament in the light of the New, and take to heart the clear words of warning and comfort (2 Pet. 3:11; Rev. 3:11). We must keep in mind the limitations imposed upon us, because many things are still hidden concerning the specific exposition and application of prophecy, types, and events which are still in the process of development or lie in the future. Likewise, there is no binding exegesis of all parts of the prophecies in Revelation. In the interpretation of Revelation special care and patience must be exercised, yes, even the weak must be borne, provided, of course, that they will accept the infallible authority of Holy Scripture and the doctrines clearly revealed therein and recognize the centrality of the doctrine of justification. In the interest of these two Reformation principles they must

also be ready to wield the weapons of the Spirit against all corruption or alteration and thus serve the true peace of the Church.

Enthusiasm is always legalistic, is in the last instance a this-worldly religion (*zielt zuletzt auf Diesseitsanbetung*) (Col. 2:8), and therefore opposed to the true Gospel, for the Scriptural doctrine of man's total depravity admits no this-worldly foundation for the hope of salvation (Gal. 1:4; 6:14). The Gospel, on the other hand, elevates the hearts, directs poor sinners through the offer of free grace to their eternal home (*das die armen Suender durch gewisse, freie Gnade in der Ewigkeit beheimatet*), and thus makes them joyful in service while in this world (Tit. 2:1—3:8).

The Scriptural and confessional doctrine on eschatology engenders true ecclesiastical activity (Acts 1:1-11). Such ecclesiastical activity realizes that the warfare between the true Church and the ungodly world will continue, that it must reckon with the possibility of temptation and tribulation in the end (Matt. 24:9-14, 22), and therefore looks forward with patience and joy to the Day of Judgment, the returning Lord, the resurrection of the body, and the perfect life in eternal communion with God and His people (Luke 21:28; *Trigl.*, 458:14). Therefore the purpose of preaching the pure Gospel is to prepare, in the power of God, for eternal life (Mark 16:15-16; Rev. 22:17, 20-21).

Contributors to This Issue

Dr. L. W. Spitz holds the chair of Systematic Theology and Symbolics at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

Dr. F. E. Mayer is professor of Systematic Theology at the same institution.

Homiletics

A Series of Sermon Studies for the New Church Year

During the next twelve months the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY will present a series of sermon studies on Epistle texts. No specific pericopic system will be employed, but the effort has been made to choose texts which are related in thought to the theme of the service and which have not been treated during the past five years in this publication or in the *Concordia Pulpit*.

Our readers varied in their reactions to the type of sermon study provided during the past year. The great majority were favorable. In some instances our contributors will amplify the outlines and thus meet the chief objection to the current method.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT

HEB. 10:19-25

The Text and the Day. — The Propers for the day stress the believer's confidence and joy in the coming of the Lord. Confidence and joy presuppose readiness. In our text the writer to the Hebrews gives instruction for such confident readiness "as ye see the day approaching."

Notes on Meaning. — The "therefore" of v. 19 demands a careful reading of chapters 9 and 10. — Compare 9:3 with 9:8 and with 10:19; 9:14 with 10:22; 9:28 with 10:25; et al. — The argument preceding the text has been: God commanded many symbolical acts and arrangements for the Tabernacle. Each of these signified, in one manner or another, that Christ would "by His own blood enter in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," 9:12. Now see 10:12. *Therefore*, brethren, we have boldness, full assurance of faith. — "Holiest" is heaven, or immediate access to God's throne of grace. — "Through the veil": As the priest of old had to pass beyond the veil to reach the mercy seat, so Jesus passed through the incarnation to reach the final sacrifice, its reward, and its result. — "Sprinkled from an evil conscience":

a conscience cleansed by the washing (sprinkling) of the blood of Christ. — I refer the "bodies washed with pure water" to Holy Baptism.

Preaching Pitfalls. — Care must be exercised in comparisons with the details of the Old Testament worship. All parts of that worship were symbolical of the atoning work of the Savior. It is advisable to describe only such parts of the Old Testament worship and Tabernacle as will be referred to in the exposition of vv. 19 and 20. Too much descriptive material will confuse and obscure the real point of the comparison. — There is probably a natural tendency, aided by the location of v. 25 in our Catechism, to overstress "assembling of ourselves together" in the sense of church attendance. That is, of course, included and may well be mentioned in the application, especially on this first day of a new church year. But it must always be kept in its proper sphere: a means to, and result of, "full assurance of faith." — Note also that "exhorting one another" applies more to 25 b than to 25 a.

Preaching Emphases. — A precious opportunity is presented at the very first service of the new church year to emphasize the full atonement by Christ and its result in the life of the Christian. We may well look upon this sermon as the "theme sermon" for a year's preaching. For faith and life, for soul and body, firm trust in the one sacrifice for man's sin is the dynamo that gives power to all. In the face of economic, ethical, moral, eternal problems, personal or global, being prepared for "His day" gives boldness and confidence for the interim. When we have a firm trust in Jesus' preparations for us for that day, being a Christian ceases to be a complex riddle and becomes a glorious adventure tending to a glorious end. But Christians must not only *expect* the coming of the Lord, but be *prepared* for it, which gives confident joy.

Problem and Goal. — To lead the hearer to the conviction that the coming of the Lord Jesus is imminent, but that this conviction does not breed fear. Strive to have the hearer, leaving God's house, feel: If Jesus come tomorrow, He has made me ready to meet Him. If I remain here for many days, He has given me the necessities for an even greater confidence, preparedness, joy.

*Outline:***THE JOYOUS CHRISTIAN CONFIDENCE**

- I. *Wherein Christian confidence consists.*
 - A. In a bold approach to the throne of Grace.
 - B. In a full assurance of faith.
- II. *Whereon this Christian confidence is based.*
 - A. On the faithfulness of Him who promises.
 - B. On the knowledge that He is our High Priest.
 - C. On the certainty of our ability to draw near to God.
- III. *How this Christian confidence is maintained and increased.*
 - A. By holding fast the profession of our faith.
 - B. By provoking one another to love.
 - C. By not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together.
 - D. By exhorting one another.

H. B. ROEPE

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT

2 PET. 1:2-9

The Text and the Day. — While the knowledge of Christ's momentous coming to judge the world in righteousness fills the hearts and minds of some with dread and horror, this same knowledge inspires others to petition the Holy Spirit, the Oil of Gladness, to multiply unto them grace and peace. Endowed richly with these blessings, the Day of Judgment, as terrifying as it is to those who live without Christ, without hope, and without God, is to those called to glory and virtue a day on which they, as God's children, will realize the fulfillment of the great and precious promises of eternal salvation made unto them by their eternal and benevolent God and Father.

Notes on Meaning. — "This entire epistle takes for granted that the reader possesses the knowledge of God" (Bengel). V. 2: Peter uses *epignosis*, "complete knowledge," not *gnoosis*, which is employed by Paul (Rom. 1:21) participially when referring to the incomplete knowledge the heathen possess of God. *Epignosis* implies also a more intimate relationship and knowledge. Original: "In [not through] the knowledge."

V. 3: *Zoee*: New life in the Christian believer; *eusebeia*, as may be seen from the context: godliness as carried out into practice. Note that *life* and *godliness* here go hand in hand. In the following verse *corruption* is the antithesis of *life*; *lust*, of *godliness*. "*To glory and virtue*," original: His own glory and virtue. *Aretee* is not ordinary virtue, but outstanding virtue or excellence.

V. 4: *Whereby*: "His glory making the promises to be exceedingly great, His virtue making them precious" (Bengel). *Epangelmata*: promised blessings; "these promises have a sanctifying effect on the believer, assimilating him to God," (Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown). *Geneesthe*: "*ye may become partakers*" (R. V.), now in part, in heaven perfectly, 1 John 3:2. *Physis*: nature, not essence. We partake of this nature only through Christ, our Mediator. This acquisition is an escape, a being rescued, not merely an intellectual effort of some sort. *En epithymia*: in [not through] inordinate and unbridled affection for earthly things. The fault lies *within* man himself. *Phthora*: moral decay; man becomes either regenerate or degenerate.

V. 5: "Peter here teaches that so-called practical Christianity without the spiritual motive is incomplete and unintelligent" (*Expositor's Greek Testament*). *Spoudee*: earnestness as well as diligence. *Pareispherein*: to contribute in addition to something else. *Epichoreegeoo*: providing more than what is barely needed ("add to" of A. V. too weak); in other words, provide sumptuously, lavishly. *En tee pistei*: faith mentioned first, then its fruits. *Aretee*: strenuous energy; *gnoosis*: discretion. The fruits of faith specified are seven, the number of completion. Bengel: "Faith leads, love brings up the rear."

V. 6: *Engkrateian*: self-control. "Incontinence weakens the mind, continence strengthens it" (Bengel). *Hypomoneen*: not a stoical endurance, but one trusting in God; *eusebeian*: false teachers are ungodly persons (*asebeis*).

V. 7: *Philadelphia*: love toward the brethren; *agapee*: love toward all men, including enemies. This love is more than an emotional manifestation; it is directed by deliberate choice.

V. 8: *Hyparchonta*: being at hand, subsisting; *kathisteesin*: render you habitually; *argous*: unproductive, ineffective, em-

phasized by *akarpous*, James 2:20: Faith without works is *argee*, barren, useless; *epignooosis*: "Die *epignooosis* ist ihrer Natur nach etwas, was waechst."

V. 9: *Mee paresti*: lacketh; *typhlos*: blind to what exists; *myoopazon*: nearsighted; may be clear-sighted in worldly matters, but closes eyes to the things of God; *leetheen*: willful forgetfulness; *katharismou*: purging; was used in connection with ceremonial washings of the Jews; may here refer to Baptism.

Preaching Pitfalls.—Luther replies to the question: "What is the divine nature?" by stating: "Eternal truth, righteousness, eternal life, peace, joy, delight, and whatsoever good may be named. Hence he who becomes a partaker of the divine nature is wise, righteous, and omnipotent against the devil, sin, and death." The expression, therefore, "conveys the thought not so much of the *substantia* as rather of the *qualitas*" (Meyer's Commentary). Cf. John 1:12-13; Heb. 12:10; 1 Pet. 1:23.

Preaching Emphases.—Our knowledge of God and our relationship to Him are neither barren nor ineffectual. The father-son (daughter) relationship which exists between God and His children not only purges us from our old sins and endows us with virtue, but it also makes us recipients of God's great and glorious promises. These gifts become ours through the redeeming knowledge of Jesus Christ.

Problem and Goal.—"Let your conversation be as it becometh the Gospel of Christ" (Phil. 1:27). "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:14). "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). The blessed season of Advent is indeed a good season in which to think on these things.

Outline:

CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE BEARING FRUIT

- I. Reveals to us exceeding great and precious promises.
- II. Informs us how we may escape corruption and obtain virtue.
- III. Specifies how we might be partakers of the divine nature and heirs of life eternal.

Suggested hymns: 61, 63, 74

WALTER E. BUSZIN

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT

2 TIM. 4:5-8

The Text and the Day. — The Third Sunday in Advent has appropriately gained the character of being the Sunday of the holy ministry because the ancient Gospel text (Matt. 11:2-10) deals with Jesus' testimony regarding the ministry of John the Baptist; and in the ancient Epistle text (1 Cor. 4:1-5) the great minister Paul discusses the office of the ministry also. Obviously, the Epistle text before us fits perfectly into the picture and even adds the fine Advent thought of looking forward to Christ's Advent on Judgment Day.

Notes on Meaning. — "Sober" here in the Greek really means "calm and watchful and collected in spirit." The word used for "suffer afflictions" is used frequently of the hardships of military service (2 Tim. 2:3), which fits well here also. "Make full proof of thy ministry" implies: "Do not shirk any phase of your ministerial duties," Col. 4:17. "Offered" alludes to Paul's pouring out his blood as a drink offering not as a sacrifice of atonement, but as a thankoffering to God for His mercy. (Phil. 2:7.) "Departure" is the picture of a ship loosed from its moorings preparatory to setting sail, Phil. 1:23. "Kept" denotes "hold firmly." "Love" here means "to welcome with desire, to long for." It is a remarkable feature to see how Paul combines past, present, and future in this dramatic swan song.

Preaching Pitfalls. — Let us avoid using this text to bring some "pet peeve" regarding our ministry to the attention of the congregation. This text, together with the regular texts for this day, is to make everyone of us feel how little and how lazy we are in comparison to divine standards for a *full* Gospel ministry and even in comparison to men like John the Baptist and Paul. There is, therefore, no room in this sermon for self-glorification. Let us also emphasize that these words are not only Paul's words, but above all God's Word. Paul and Timothy and John the Baptist will serve best here as illustrations.

Preaching Emphases. — With Christmas near at hand, ministers are often exceedingly busy, but perhaps at no season of the year do any of us lead the *full* life which John the Baptist and Paul led as messengers of Jesus. This text gives us

good occasion to preach to ourselves, and then also to show the congregation that *we need* an abundant measure of the grace of God in Christ Jesus because of our sins and infirmities and deficiencies. Thus also as ministers we are looking forward to Christmas because *our* Savior was born, and we long, together with all Christians, for the final appearing of Jesus to take us home to heaven.

Problem and Goal.—It was Paul's purpose by the inspiration of God to encourage Timothy to go on boldly as a messenger of Jesus in spite of the evil times and in spite of the martyrdom of Paul. It should be the Christian pastor's purpose here to show his people that he has no regrets that he has entered the ministry and does not seek sympathy, but rather asks his people to share in the *joy* of his ministry by joining in with the best of their abilities and according to their station in the *full* life of the Gospel ministry.

Outline:

THE FULL LIFE OF FAITHFUL MESSENGERS OF JESUS

- I. In their youth and years of activity.
 - A. They will be calm and watchful.
 - B. They will be ready to endure hardships.
 - C. Their one message will be the Gospel of Jesus.
 - D. They will shirk no responsibilities and dodge no issues.
 - E. Wherein I have failed, I ask Jesus and you to forgive me; wherein His grace has made me strong, I ask you to follow me.
- II. In their age and under the shadow of death.
 - A. They will be faithful unto death, even martyrdom.
 - B. They look back upon their past ministry with joy.
 - C. They are content at present, sure of a reward of grace above.
 - D. They look forward to the future joy with hopeful anticipation.
 - E. They bequeath the Gospel to those that shall follow them.
 - F. Regardless of our age or danger of death, such is also our Advent faith and hope; yours also, we hope.

WALTER W. STUENKEL

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT

2 COR. 4:3-6

The Text and the Day. — In olden days this last Sunday before the great day was called *Praeparatio*, the preparation. Our hearts are attuned to expectation. In a wondrous song we sing: "Drop down, ye heavens, from above, and let the skies pour down righteousness." — How shall we prepare to welcome Him? By following the Herald's cry: "Make straight the way of the Lord." We need to learn the emptiness of our life that we may reach out for the fullness of Christ. Therefore we pray in the Collect: "Stir up Thy power, and come, and with great might succor us, that by the help of Thy grace whatsoever is hindered by our sins may be speedily accomplished by Thy mercy and satisfaction."

Notes on Meaning. — V. 3: "If our Gospel be hid," i. e., veiled. Paul still has in mind the imagery of chap. 3:13-16, referring to the veil upon the face of Moses and the hearts of the Israelites. V. 4: "The god of this world" is Satan, the great idol, who demands worship and receives it from the multitudes who lie at his feet. "Hath blinded the minds of them which believe not." "This shows clearly that unbelief is the reason for their blindness, for unbelief cannot 'see' the Gospel with its light, though it is constantly proclaimed" (Luther). V. 5: Paul had previously said that his ministry is (1) one of triumph (2 Cor. 2:14-15); (2) a divinely accredited ministry (2 Cor. 3:1-5); (3) a spiritual and glorious, not a legal, ministry (2 Cor. 3:6-18); (4) an honest ministry (2 Cor. 4:1); (5) a ministry commended by the life he led (2 Cor. 4:2); a ministry in which not self, but Christ Jesus, the Lord is preached. V. 6: In the face of Moses men saw the Law; in the face of Jesus Christ they see the Gospel. By a clear revelation through Jesus Christ the Gospel brings the knowledge of the divine glory.

Praching Emphases. — Our faithful God has come to our rescue, driven back the darkness, revealed the glory of His grace in the face of Christ Jesus. As the sun gives physical light, so that Daystar from on high gives the light we need for our souls. Unbelief embraces darkness; faith embraces light. While other lights are going out over the world, one

faithful light remains, the light of the glorious love and mercy of God, revealed in Him who is Himself the Light of the world.

Problem and Goal. — To show that only a Christmas brightened by the light of Christ's glorious revelation is a Christmas that escapes the darkness of the world. If our Christmas is to be glad with holy joy, it must come with the joy light of Christian faith for every heart.

Outline:

THE JOY LIGHT OF CHRISTMAS

- I. It comes from the Father of lights.
 - A. Light for the world at creation.
 - B. Light for the soul through the Lord Jesus Christ.
- II. It shines in the face of our Savior.
 - A. There we can see what God is like.
 - B. There we can see God's will for us.
- III. It is a faithful and true light.
 - A. This light shines faithfully over the whole world.
 - B. The rulers of darkness oppose it.
 - C. It brightens every believing heart.

C. W. BERNER

CHRISTMAS DAY

HEB. 10:5-10

The Text and the Day. — How this precious Christmas text could for so long remain unnoticed is a mystery. "*When He cometh into the world, He saith. . .*" Here we have Christ's words, spoken at His coming, concerning His coming, and conveying the real meaning of His coming and of Christmas.

Notes on Meaning. — "*Wherefore*": because "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" (v. 4). Four lambs every day, eight every Sabbath, eleven animals every new moon, additional offerings every festival day — 1167 public sacrifices every year, besides unnumbered private sacrifices and the unbloody sacrifices of cereals, wine, and incense: such were the demands of God for 1500 years. The reason: sin, which can be atoned for only

by blood. "Without shedding of blood is no remission" of sins, Heb. 9:22. So the blood of animals flowed in streams until the coming of the Babe of Bethlehem.

But "*when He cometh into the world, He saith: Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not. . . . In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou hast had no pleasure.*" Though required by God, these sacrifices had no power to remove sin (v. 4). Nor did they relieve men of the consciousness of sin (v. 2). In fact, their continual repetition was a constant reminder of sin (v. 3). At the same time, however — and that was their chief purpose — they focused the eyes of the faithful on the promised Sin-Bearer, "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." But more these animal sacrifices could not do. Hymn 156:1. Therefore Christ at His coming into the world said to the Father: "*Sacrifice Thou wouldest not.*"

"*But a body hast Thou prepared Me.*" Here is the heart of Christmas. Christ would say: "I am born to die. I, Thy eternal Son, have become the Son of Man to redeem man. Thou, Father, hast given Me a body that I might have blood, that I might shed that blood, and that by the shedding of My blood — God's blood — I might do that which all the blood of animals could not do — take away sin."

"*Then said I, Lo, I come . . . to do Thy will, O God!*" That sounds like a shout of joyful anticipation. "*I come,*" because I want to come and carry out God's plan for the redemption of the world as announced "*in the Volume of the Book.*" "*My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me and to finish His work,*" John 4:34. And finish it He did. He ascends the altar. "*He taketh away the first,*" the animal sacrifices, "*that He may establish the second,*" the sacrifice of His own body. He dies the death He wants to die, but only after He has proclaimed the accomplished salvation of the world with the cry "It is finished!" That is what our text means when it concludes: "*By the which will,*" namely, by the will of God as joyfully carried out by His Son, "*we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.*"

Problem and Goal. — The problem: because of Modernist conceptions, which make light of sin and regard Christ as a mere moralist, few people know the true meaning of Christmas. The goal: to help our hearers celebrate a real Christmas

by leading them to the realization of the sinfulness of their sin, to the acceptance of Christ as their Sin-Bearer, and to the dedication of their lives to His services.

Outline:

WHAT CHRIST SAID WHEN HE CAME INTO THE WORLD

I. "*Sacrifice Thou wouldst not.*"

The many Old Testament sacrifices. Only blood can atone for sin. But such is the sinfulness of sin that even the streams of blood which flowed from Jewish altars could not wash it away. Neither can anything that you may do or suffer.

II. "*But a body hast Thou prepared Me.*"

The Christmas story. God gave His Son a body that He might have blood — blood which, because it is God's blood, could atone for all our sins. That is the all-glorious meaning of Christmas. Christ was born, not merely to be our Teacher and Example, but to be our Sin-Bearer and Savior. Accept Him as such, trust in Him, and you have forgiveness, life, and heaven.

III. "*Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God!*"

Christ's love for the Father and you moved Him willingly and joyfully to come and die for your sins. Your love for Christ must move you, in like spirit, to live your life for Him.

OSWALD RIESS

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS

1 TIM. 3:16

The Text and the Day. — A wonderful *post festum* text. In it we still hear, as it were, the pealing of Christmas bells and the refrain of Christmas anthems. The message and the songs of the festival season are not to be heard and sung in vain.

Notes on Meaning. — The truth that is to be unfolded in our brief text is the pillar and foundation of the Church of the living God. The personal union of the two natures in Christ is a confessedly great mystery that transcends all human comprehension. The invisible God was visible in the

flesh (John 1:14). Christ was God Invisible from all eternity. In the person of Jesus Christ divinity and humanity were so closely united that whosoever saw the Man Jesus saw God. (John 14:9; John 10:30.) Where this great and blessed mystery is known, true godliness is generated, namely, love to God and the brethren. (1 John 4.)

Of Jesus Christ, who is God manifest in the flesh, it is said that He is "justified in the Spirit." Note the antithesis between *sarx* and *pneuma*. The latter denotes the divine nature of Christ, the former the human nature. According to both natures Christ has taken away the sin of the world. Thereby He has appeased the wrath of God and effected the reconciliation between God and man. Christ is our Substitute. But His substitutionary work had to be perfect to include all mankind. (1 John 2:2). The union of the two natures guarantees this perfection. Christ has been justified as our Substitute. Thus He is "made unto us Righteousness" (1 Cor. 1:30; 1 Pet. 3:18). "He was delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification" (Rom. 4:25).

"Seen of the angels." When and where? The Son of God, manifested in the flesh, accepted the ministrations of the good angels during His humiliation. (Matt. 4:11; Luke 22:43.) These angels were present at His birth, proclaimed His resurrection, and stood by at His ascension. They also behold in beatific vision the fullness of His glory in His exaltation. (Eph. 1:10, 20; 3:10, 20; 1 Pet. 1:12; Heb. 1:6.)

"Preached unto the Gentiles." With a few notable exceptions the activity of the manifested Redeemer was confined to the covenant people, the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Then, before He ascended into heaven, He issued His majestic command (Matt. 28:19-20). The middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles was broken down. (Eph. 2:14.) St. Paul already made headway in preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles (Eph. 3:8.)

"Believed on in the world." For nearly 2,000 years Christ, manifested in the flesh, has been the Sum and Substance of all Christian preaching; so also He has been the Substance of all Christian belief. The Gospel of Jesus Christ has been a "power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth" (Rom. 1:16; Is. 55:10). It is not believed *by* the world (most people reject the Gospel), but *in* the world a

great multitude (Rev. 7:9) of repentant sinners have come to the saving faith by the operation of a gracious God.

"Received into glory." These words refer first to the ascension of Christ (Mark 16:19; Luke 24:51; Acts 1:2), but also to the succeeding state of glory, in which Christ, according to His human nature, entered into the full and constant use of His divine majesty communicated to His human nature (Eph. 1:20-22; Eph. 4:10). For our comfort Jesus has promised us John 14:1-3.

Preaching Emphases.—Like John 3:16, our text is a brief summary of the whole Gospel. It is most likely a stanza out of an ancient hymn of praise dedicated to the person and work of Christ, then also to the blessed activity of the Church, and finally to the glory of the Church Triumphant. Whether our hearers believe it or not, they cannot deny that the claims of Christianity are tremendous.

Preaching Pitfalls.—Two trilogies are noted. Three pairs have been noted by others: (1) flesh—spirit, (2) angels—nations, (3) world—glory. We prefer the trilogy as indicated in the appended outline.

Problem and Goal.—That Christ be magnified by the glorious hymn of praise. (Phil. 1:20; Acts 19:17.)

Outline:

AN APOSTOLIC HYMN OF PRAISE
TO THE NEWBORN SAVIOR

- I. It exalts the Person and the work of the newborn Savior.
 - A. God was manifest in the flesh (Incarnation).
 - B. Justified in the Spirit (Resurrection).
 - C. Seen of the Angels (Ascension).
- II. It exalts the fruits of His redeeming work.
 - A. Preaching unto the Gentiles (Preaching).
 - B. Believed on in the World (Faith).
 - C. Received up into glory (Kingdom of Glory).

H. C. HARTING

NEW YEAR'S EVE

PHIL. 3:13 b-14

Text and Day. — New Year's Eve looks back with a spiritual audit; New Year's Day looks forward with hope in Christ. Yet the two are not separable. Hymns, prayers, psalmody will be chosen to sharpen the mood of self-examination, but also to insert into that mood the trust in Christ and the desire to live for Christ.

Notes on Meaning. — This sectioning of the text is suggested in order to lend emphasis to the "forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before." St. Paul has discussed the objective of the Christian's grasp and life, beginning with v. 7. That objective is complete salvation in Christ Jesus, v. 9. Components of this salvation are the experience of Christ as Savior, v. 8; justification, v. 9; newness of life and mind, vv. 10-11; and ability to suffer with Him and thus be glorified with Him, v. 10 (cf. 2:5-10). This great complex of goals is the Savior's design for the Christian, v. 12 b; to that end He gave Himself in the atonement. Now the text makes clear that the Apostle does not think of that entire process as already complete; the full resurrection of the spirit here, and of body and spirit in eternity, has not yet taken place. (Cf. 2:12; 1 Cor. 10:12 ff.) Hence it is the great program of the Christian life to "reach forth unto those things which are before." "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," i. e., because of the atonement, and through the Gospel of that atonement, God summons man to this resurrection of the entire self and to an eternity of communion with Him — a prize beside which every other goal of life fades into insignificance. (Cf. v. 7.) This also implies "forgetting those things which are behind." In the context this implies levels of spiritual excellence which might cause pride or self-satisfaction. (Cf. 3:3-8.) But it is not beyond the Apostle's thought to include also the shortcomings and sins which might cause discouragement. (Cf. 4:12-13.)

Preaching Pitfalls — Our outline suggests a paradox for the sake of emphasis — what dare we not forget, what must we forget, as we review the past year? The danger must be resisted of leaving the main point unclear. — The core of the

text is expressed in very general terms — “things,” “prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.” The sermon will achieve its purpose only as the pastor conveys very clear concepts of the life in Christ and of the way of pursuing it as a goal.

Problem and Goal. — To give the Christian a final insight into the meaning of the year which he is closing, namely, a march and drive on to the fuller life in Christ and to refresh in his mind the techniques for continuing that progress.

Outline:

WHAT SHALL BE OUR ATTITUDE TO THE YEAR
NOW ENDING?

- I. Our spiritual attainments during this past year we shall forget.
 - A. The excellencies: growth in Christian living, trust and faith in God, richer prayer, etc. We shall forget them; for they were imperfect, far short of the great goal to which God would have us attain in Christ.
 - B. The shortcomings: our sins, pride, godlessness, succumbing to the world, fear of the trials and tests of faith. They were there for a purpose, they have done their work. Now God offers us full pardon in Christ (Holy Communion to be stressed, if celebrated in this service) and power to move on to new fruits of grace.
- II. The great goal of life in Christ is still before us.
 - A. The resurrection of Christ in our hearts, the greater and greater possession of the Spirit of God; and the final resurrection of body and soul with God in eternity — these in their fullness are still ahead.
 - B. Hence we press on toward it. How? By holding before us the atoning Christ; by making His Word the tool toward genuinely “knowing” Him; by making progress each new day toward fuller life in Him.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

Theological Observer

KFUO and the Lutheran Hour.—The march of the Gospel continues. While the imprint of secularism can be seen all about us, there is no generation in which the Good News has been spread so widely and powerfully as in ours. We are happy to announce that KFUO has added substantially to its plant and equipment and that its renovated and enlarged facilities have been dedicated on October 17 to their exalted, holy use. It is a synodical child and receives an appropriation for its work, but what is granted is hardly more than a token. The station has to be supported by the direct gifts of its friends and well-wishers. Many of those who send donations are not members of the Lutheran Church or of any Church.

The Lutheran Hour, embarked now on its sixteenth season, has quite correctly been called one of the grandest evangelization agencies which the world has seen. Dr. Walter A. Maier continues to serve as its regular preacher. It seems incredible, but is borne out by the lists at the Lutheran Hour office, that the message of this herald of the Gospel is now heard over 1,100 stations in nearly all the countries of the world. In humble gratitude we bow our heads and invoke God's blessings on both the ventures mentioned. Like KFUO for the by far greater part of its budget, the Lutheran Hour has to depend mainly on the support of its friends—the people inside and outside our church body who desire to see the good news of pardon through the blood of Christ spread throughout the world. Those who would like to receive full and detailed information on its globe-encircling activities should write the Lutheran Hour Office, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., for a copy of the October issue of the *Lutheran Hour News*. KFUO regularly issues a bulletin which can be obtained by writing to the station.

A.

Dr. Hamann's Remarks on the Breslau-Free Church "Theses of Union."—The "Theses of Union" adopted by the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church (Free Church of Saxony) have rightly aroused interest far beyond the confines of Germany. In far-away Australia, Dr. H. Hamann, principal of Concordia College (Unley, S. A.), has published a translation of the Theses as they were submitted to him in typewritten copy, together with notes and comments which, we believe, will greatly interest our readers. Professor Hamann, for a number of years, has proved himself, in his capacity as editor of the *Australasian Theological Review*, a man of sound judgment, rare insight, and broad vision, whose opinions are worth noting. His fine translation of the Theses and his comments appeared in the December, 1947, issue of the periodical just mentioned. In an "editorial note" Dr. Hamann writes by way of preface: "The doctrinal matters that divided Breslau from our Free Church brethren parallel, to a certain extent, the

divergent doctrinal views and teachings that have hitherto separated the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia from the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia. The publication of the *Einigungssatzte*, which we offer to our readers in exact translation, may help to remove whatever doctrinal and practical differences still keep the two branches of the Australian Lutheran Church apart. Such at least is the ardent hope and the earnest desire of the editors."

Summing up his impressions of the "Theses of Union," Dr. Hamann writes in conclusion: "The translator has no fault to find with these theses and the explanatory remarks appended. In his judgment, not a particle of divinely revealed truth has been sacrificed or called into question. He also believes that our Church (the E. L. C. A.) as a whole would not hesitate to accept these *Einigungssatzte* as a basis of fellowship with the U. E. L. C. A.; and that if the latter body were to declare its acceptance of them, the remaining differences and difficulties would be overcome with comparative ease. Every reader who studies these Theses and who has followed the discussions and negotiations on Lutheran unity in the United States of America, cannot fail to observe a certain similarity between them and the 'Declaration' of the American Lutheran Church as regards both the matter treated and the manner of treatment. The *Einigungssatzte* are perhaps a little more carefully and conservatively worded, but the kinship is unmistakable. It is probably due not to accident, nor only to the fact that there were points of contact between Breslau and the former Iowa-Ohio Synods, but to a study of the documents that have so long engaged the attention of the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church. Of the five 'points of doctrine' that were declared to be non-divisive of fellowship in 1938, three are thus designated by the *Einigungssatzte*, viz., the chronology of the Thousand Years, the possibility of the conversion of larger numbers of Jews in the last times, and the possibility that, before the end, the Antichrist may unite with other antichristian forces. In short, it is admitted that the Word does not reveal all that the future may bring. There is no mention of the resurrection of some martyrs before the general resurrection—and a very good thing, too. Besides, Breslau seems to have accepted the only sound definition of the Church and of its *notae*. The concluding remarks on eschatology added to the theses strike us as quite admirable, considered both theologically and practically. At about the same time when the Scriptural truths and principles embodied in the *Einigungssatzte* prepared the way for unity and fellowship in Germany, the Missouri Synod withdrew the Basis of Fellowship of 1938, though this action did not carry with it any repudiation or condemnation of the doctrinal contents of that Basis. Perhaps no other measure was open to the Chicago Centennial Convention if it wished to escape from the *impasse* created by subsequent resolutions in 1941 and 1944 as well as by

conditions within the Synodical Conference. Yet if the cause of Lutheran unity is to be advanced in America and Australia, it will have to be done in somewhat the same manner as that adopted by the *Einigungssatze*; for church-fellowship presupposes, not absolute unanimity on all matters that may occur to the Christian when contemplating the entire body of Divine Truth, but 'common acceptance and confession of all doctrines revealed in Holy Scripture.'"

J. T. M.

The New Zealand District Convention of 1948.—The *Australian Lutheran* (June 23, 1948) reports on the annual convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Concordia Conference of New Zealand, held in the capital city of Wellington, from May 15 to 17. The convention was attended by the Rev. F. Hassold of Eudunda, Australia, as the official representative of the General President, and by Mr. Ben Koch of Adelaide, who addressed primarily the laymen of the District. The New Zealand District is perhaps the smallest in any Church affiliated with the Missouri Synod. Its pastoral conference numbers only six persons: Pastors M. Hedrich, G. Fischer, C. Venz, H. Te Punga, C. Koch, and J. Paech. Essays were read on the subject "Pastor and People." While the congregations are few and scattered, President Fischer urged thanksgiving to God for many blessings bestowed by Him upon the Church in New Zealand during the past year, especially the remarkable increase in attendance at the Lord's Table. The brethren were grateful also for the deep interest which the Australian Church took in their welfare and for the many greetings which the convention received. Despite the small numbers and the many difficulties they are facing in their work, our New Zealand brethren are faithfully continuing in the Lord's work, the report showing no discouragement on their part at all. May the ever-supporting presence of our precious Lord be their comfort and strength in their arduous and lonely, but glorious task.

J. T. M.

Barth vs. Brunner on Communism.—Under this heading the *Christian Century*, August 4, sheds light on the lively question, why Karl Barth has taken no position on the question of Communism, whereas he took such a violent position against Nazism. This topic is discussed widely in German theology today. Our readers will therefore be interested in having a résumé of the entire issue as it was brought to light in the correspondence between Barth and Brunner. We quote from the *Christian Century*. "Since Brunner insists that totalitarianism is the same, whether Nazi or Communist, Barth's present position is unintelligible to him. Must not the church of necessity, with unambiguity and passion, say No to Communist totalitarianism, just as it said No to Hitler? . . . Existing Communism leads logically to totalitarianism. The question for the Christian church, therefore, is not whether it will take a negative stand against ideal communism, but whether it will say No to a total state, which is the only kind consistent with existing Communism. . . . Brunner favors certain

state controls and even state ownership. There is a strong movement toward the correction of these capitalistic abuses. . . . Socialism, he reminds Barth, is not authoritarian, which is one of the reasons why Communism seeks to destroy it. 'Shall we allow socialism to be assassinated by our refusal to say anything as Christians against its murderers?' Must not Christians rather join with Socialists in this battle? To remain silent is to deny a fundamental Christian principle—something Christians must never do. For the totalitarian state does not recognize the natural rights of human personality. It is also atheistic by its very nature. . . . Brunner notes that Hromadka of Prague, formerly of Princeton, takes practically the same position as Barth, in that he interprets the present situation as a historical necessity. . . . As for the argument that by opposing these Communist governments Protestants will be aligning themselves with the Roman Catholic Church, Brunner asks whether, just because the Roman Church takes an anti-Communist stand, Protestants must stand aside. Did not Protestants and Catholics stand side-by-side against Hitler? . . . Barth's reply is characteristic. Christians, he declares, do not act by eternal and guiding principles, but according to the authority of the Word of God in concrete situations. What obtained in 1933 simply does not obtain now. The situation is different. Therefore, the Word of God which must be spoken today must be formulated afresh. The position of the church in political matters, says Barth, is determined at the point where the church faces the necessity of speaking responsibly out of the Word of God. The church has nothing, as church, to do with isms and systems, but only with the Word of God in historical situations. It does not speak according to 'principles.' The church makes her judgment according to the situation. One day she may speak and another day she may be silent. She declines to systematize her actions. She insists upon keeping her freedom to speak when the time comes to speak. The church confronted such a concrete situation in 1933. It was time to speak then. Why? Because Hitler's regime represented a temptation to the church. Many an American, Britisher, and Frenchman admired Hitler. Even Churchill had something good to say for him! The nations allowed themselves to be seduced by nazism, which claimed to be Christian. It was not a question of totalitarianism, nor of nihilism, nor of anti-Semitism. Hitlerism had a charm about it which overwhelmed men's souls and made them believe its lies. It was a matter of life and death for the church, since nazism was a 'masked godlessness.' This, says Barth, is why he would not compromise at that time, nor pardon any who had collaborated. But, asks Barth, are we faced by the same situation today? Can we apply what we said then against nazism to Communism now? He has seen western Germany and the non-Russian sectors of Berlin. He knows the fear, the hate, the repugnance which is felt toward this 'eastern monster.' But among those who have this feeling, there is not one who regards Communism as a temptation which constitutes a danger! None will

go along with Communism, except a few Communists. Is this not also true of those who live in America, England, and France? 'Whoever wants a political negation from me against this system and method can have it immediately.' But it is rather cheap to give, and cheap to have! Barth will not admit that it is a Christian, or a church, responsibility to say about Communism what every citizen can read in his newspaper and what Mr. Truman and the pope are saying so well. Has the 'East,' or whatever one may call it, such a power over us that we must counteract it with an ultimate word? No, says Barth, for when the church confesses its faith, it does so by going against the tide with fear and trembling. Surely the church has no cause to go against the tide today by giving its witness against Communism, because Communism does not merit this, whether on account of its Marxist, its imperialistic or its Asiatic elements. . . . Where is the spiritual danger, or the need, which requires that the church should give a witness to this truth? What is the occasion? Whom would the church instruct, set right, comfort, or call to repentance and new life thereby? Certainly not the nations of the 'Christian' West. Certainly not the Americans! Are they not secure enough against Russia without our Christian assurance? Certainly not the poor Russians and the poor Communists! . . . If a concrete situation should arise as it did in 1933-45, then we shall have to see how to deal with the situation that may have developed. But in any case, says Barth, it will not be according to any of the timeless 'principles' to which Brunner wished to win me. It will begin, rather, with the first sentence of the Barmen Declaration, which was distasteful to Brunner at the time it was adopted." [ED. NOTE: The first Barmen thesis stated that "Jesus Christ as He is testified to us in Holy Scriptures, is the one Word of God to which we must listen, and which we must obey in life and death. We reject the error as though the church may seek as the source of its proclamation events, persons, powers, and truths aside of the Word of God as God's revelation." According to the principles of dialectics, revelation occurs when the veiled and timeless Word of God becomes a re-vealed message for a specific person or group at a specific time.]

F. E. M.

Early Lutheran Influence in England. — Recently a book appeared which contains interesting material for all students who are engaged in research pertaining to the influence which Luther and his co-workers exerted in England when the blessed Reformation of the sixteenth century began. The book has the title *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (mainly in the reign of Henry VIII)*. The author is E. G. Rupp. The book is published by Cambridge University Press and can be obtained in New York from the Macmillan Company. The price is \$2.75. Prof. P. V. Norwood of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary reviews the book in the July, 1948, issue of the *Anglican Theological Review*. We quote a few of his sentences: "Much has been

written with regard to the impact of Calvinism and the Reformed type of Protestantism on the English Church and religion; little about the Lutheran influences which preceded. It is now more than a half-century since the publication of the *Lutheran Movement in England* by the competent American Lutheran scholar H. E. Jacobs. In the essays which make up the volume under consideration, Mr. Rupp, an English Wesleyan and 1940 winner of the Cranmer prize, returns to this neglected theme. It is his purpose to trace the avenues of infiltration of continental reformation ideas into England and the germination of Lutheran thought in English minds. Latent Lollardy was quickened by winds from across the North Sea, and our attention is called to a group of 'Christian Brethren,' an association, 'which embraced men of different callings, different interest, and different theological opinion, yet all joined by a common concern for reformation in doctrine and church life, and that linked the workers for that reform in England with their brethren overseas.' Their effective promotion of the study of the Bible and Lutheran books naturally alarmed the ecclesiastical authorities. Men like Tyndale and John Frith seem to have had connections with this group. Through the 'Brethren,' through young Cambridge dons who were adherents of the New Learning and of Erasmian Biblical scholarship, and through English exiles on the continent, Lutheranism won its way—at great personal peril to its exponents. Henry's diplomatic dealings with the Lutheran princes of Germany and their theologians are recounted at length—a matter too little regarded by Anglicans, since it was through the medium of these negotiations that the language of the Lutheran Confession entered the English formularies at certain points. Rupp's eighth chapter, 'Justification by Faith and the English Reformers,' amply demonstrates the appropriation of this cardinal article of Lutheranism by the English evangelicals—a fact unpalatable to certain myopic schools of Anglicanism, who apparently take for native manufacture what is clearly shown (by verbal parallels) to be an importation." We hope that by and by Mr. Rupp's book can be reviewed in this journal.

A.

Lambeth and Pan-Protestantism.—*America* (August 28, 1948) presents an excellent summary of the Lambeth Conference in an editorial which reads: "After five weeks of private consultation, the 326 bishops of the Anglican Communion issued on August 18 the resolutions, lengthy committee reports, and a superbly written covering letter summarizing the first Lambeth Conference to meet in eighteen years. Press reports emphasized the condemnation of Marxian, atheistic Communism, its cruelties, injustice, and lying propaganda, as a heresy, deriving from Christianity but its antithesis and contradiction. The resolution, however, concedes that, provided he believes only in Marxist economic interpretation, a Communist can be a practical Christian—a designation applied

by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the whole Russian Orthodox Church. Likewise censured were 'other forms of economic domination which do not in practise exhibit any clearer recognition of moral law.' In phrases reminiscent of last November's Statement of the Bishops of the Administrative Board of NCWC [The National Catholic Welfare Conference], the spread of secularism was deplored. Respects for human rights, irrespective of race or color, was demanded; collective control of atomic power, limitation of national sovereignties and support of UN were recommended. The growing concern of the State for human welfare was welcome, but warning was given of the encroachment of the State, especially in the field of education, which endangers human personality. Remarriage of divorced persons remains forbidden; the Committee of Marriage Discipline, however, approved a private form of prayer and dedication where marriage in the church is forbidden. Central in the Conference agenda was the theme of church unity. Lambeth, 1908, had declared that 'there could be no fulfillment of the divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which did not include the great Latin Church of the West.' Lambeth, 1948, represented the triumph of the Pan-Protestant policy in the Anglican Communion, the Conference expressing the hope of an ultimate comprehensive merger with other Protestant denominations and its present gratification at the common-denominator unity of the Church of South India. Significantly, 1948 is the fourth centenary of Cranmer's proposal to Melancthon and Calvin that Protestants should agree on a common confession of faith lest their differences make them appear contemptible in the eyes of the Roman Communion, and urging a general assembly of Protestant divines to be held in England as the safest place." The last sentence refers to a bit of history which perhaps is not generally known but shows Cranmer's close contact with both Geneva and Wittenberg. Nor is it generally known that in 1548 Cranmer had the Nuremberg Catechism translated into English, and that scarcely without any change, that he induced Justus Jonas to translate the Nuremberg Catechism Sermons into Latin, that, to win the remaining Catholics in England to Protestantism, he sent itinerant preachers throughout the land, and, finally, that he called into England a number of prominent Reformed theologians. In the following year (1549) he had the Parliament accept and sanction the first draft of the Book of Common Prayer, and when his plan to secure a common Confession of Faith, acceptable to all Protestants, failed, he moved the writing of the Forty-Two Articles of Faith, which were sanctioned in 1552. Nor must it be forgotten that in December, 1548, Melancthon published the flexible, indulgent Leipzig Interim, so violently opposed by Flacius and other Gnesio-Lutherans. It was largely the confessing spirit of Flacius and his fellow opponents of the Leipzig Interim that put an end to Melancthon's unionistic meddling with Romanists and Calvinists.

J. T. M.

International Council of Christian Churches.—Immediately before the World Council of Churches met in Amsterdam, a meeting was held in that city at which the so-called International Council of Christian Churches was organized. The *Christian Beacon* of August 26 gives this account of the meeting. "52 churches and 31 countries were represented at the first congress of the International Council of Christian Churches in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, which has now closed. And it was declared that real unity in the Spirit and in the things of Christ was enjoyed by the many delegates, observers, and advisers that attended this first congress of fundamental Bible-believing churches of the world. Elected chairman of the sessions and then elected president of the International Council, the Rev. Carl McIntire has been kept busy in directing the work of the sessions. Other officers have been elected and appointed, and the commissions to further the diversified work and ministry of the Council have been established. . . . Taking its stand on the Word of God as the only rule for faith and practice, the Council called upon 'Bible believers and true Protestants throughout the world to separate themselves' from the World Council and invited them to join the testimony of the International Council. . . . The basis of this call was the inclusion within the World Council of 'leaders and spokesmen, past and present, some of the most notorious and near-blasphemous unbelievers of the day.'"

On the World Council of Churches the official pronouncement of the International Council of Christian Churches reads thus: "While undoubtedly there are many church units in the denominations officially claimed by the World Council, as well as many individual members in all the churches belonging to the said denomination who still believe the whole Bible to be the Word of God and are Protestants in the historic sense, the World Council in its official proposals, attitude, and doctrinal expressions and ecclesiastical organizations, is anti-Biblical, anti-evangelical, and un-Protestant, as is also shown by the fact that some of its ecclesiastical units have chosen as leaders and official spokesmen, past and present, some of the most notorious and near-blasphemous unbelievers of the day. An organization which is led by men who call the doctrine of the deity of Christ 'distilled nonsense,' who discredit the Old Testament, and ridicule many of the doctrines of the New Testament, especially the truth of the efficacy of Christ's blood, cannot, in the Biblical and historical sense, truthfully be called Christian."

As to its own character and purposes, the pronouncement says: "On the other hand, the International Council of Christian Churches exists to protect against the tenets of Modernism and to proclaim the doctrines of the faith of the Reformation which it identifies as the 'faith once for all delivered to the saints,' and for which the New Testament admonishes us earnestly to contend." A.

The Harvard Lectures on Immortality. — In the *Sunday School Times* (April 3, 1948) Dr. Ernest Gordon, under the given heading, writes on the downward course which the "Harvard lectures on immortality" have taken. About 50 years ago, Miss Caroline Ingersoll of Keene, New Hampshire, dedicated \$5,000 for the establishment of a lectureship on that subject in honor of her father, a loyal alumnus of that university. These lectures were to confirm the hope of life eternal, but, as Dr. Gordon shows, they manifested, for the greater part, downright apostasy from the Christian faith. There were exceptions, of course, but most of the lectures evinced the "creeping paralysis that marks university and theological life in the America of our time." Sir William Osler, for example, the "paragon of Anglo-American medicine of the last generation," presented "an amazing essay, marked by brilliant writing," but one also "without any positive witness to the resurrection or even to immortality as a thing in any way certain." Dr. Osler was a Canadian minister's son who had drifted far from the Christian moorings. His colleague Prof. H. A. Kelly, one of Johns Hopkins' greatest surgeons, who boldly and fearlessly confessed the resurrection of the dead and life eternal through faith in Christ Jesus, was never asked by President Eliot, one of the trustees of the Ingersoll Lectureship, to state the ground of his Christian hope, though the lectureship was established for the very purpose that this Christian hope might be defended. Again, Professor Ostwald, the Leipzig chemist, then teaching at Harvard, was a leader in international free thought. His contribution was as pagan as it possibly could be, for he wrote as "a materialist with whom death ends all." Then there was Prof. Wm. James, who confessed that "his own personal feeling about immortality was never of the keenest order." He wrote: "Our common animal essence of patience under suffering and enduring effort must be what redeems us in the Deity's sight. An immortality from which these inconceivable billions of fellow strivers should be excluded becomes an irrational idea for us." To this Dr. Gordon remarks: "He forgets Romans, as Osler does 1 Cor. 15." Professor Palmer, another of the lecturers, indeed defended the immortality of the soul, but he "turned for the defense of immortality to intimations found in Shakespeare's Sonnets." His colleague Professor Royce "spent most of his time defining individuality, as if that were not a thing we could take for granted. His essay was a Sahara sand-waste, nor was there a trace of a mirage of Scriptural oasis in it." Prof. Kirsopp Lake, who also lectured on the subject, was at the time professor in the Harvard Divinity School. He wrote: "Men regard the permanent survival of their individuality much as they look at schemes for their permanent rejuvenation — a pleasant dream, as Ponce de Leon's fountain of perpetual youth." He proposed as a substitute "for the hope of a better world above for ourselves to enjoy, the pursuit of a better world for another generation to inherit." Dr. H. E. Fosdick likewise was asked to lecture, and he said, among other things, that modern minds are not concerned

with "orthodoxy's theatrical settings of heaven and hell." Shailer Mathews, onetime president of the Federal Council, delivered his lecture under the title of "Immortality and the Cosmic Process." One of his statements, quoted by Dr. Gordon, reads: "We shall never be more truly immortal than we are at the present hour." Another statement of his reads: "By making our social relationships more personal and by controlling our physical urges in the interest of those ends which are superanimal and timeless, we come into harmony with the eternal personality-producing activities of the cosmos and so share in the creative urges." Dr. J. S. Bixler, who at the time he wrote his essay was teacher of the Bible in Smith College, based his hope of immortality on Walt Whitman and Emerson. He said: "We must learn with Whitman to cultivate a mood where knowledge blends with contemplation and in which we can look up with perfect confidence and peace to the stars." Again: "It is upon the human soul with its capacity for aesthetic and mystical detachment . . . that man's theories of life must be built. It is by the light of the soul that man must go forward to wrest a meaning from the ultimate mystery and to solve the final riddle of his origin and fate." Dr. Gordon judges rightly: "Bixler trusts in man for self-redemption," and he concludes his article with the words: "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" asks the Apostle. He surely has. And how? By leaving them to their own imaginations and reasonings and philosophizings. This the Ingersoll Lectures prove to the hilt. They have forsaken the fountains of living waters and hewn themselves out broken cisterns that can hold no water, least of all water of life." Since this type of unbelief is being taught also at other higher schools of learning, it is well for us to remember in our intercessions and otherwise the splendid work which our Student Service Commission performs through the many student pastors who are serving our young people at many colleges and universities. That their work is not in vain is proved again by the April issue of the *Lutheran Student Pastor*, published by the Commission's active secretary, Rev. R. W. Hahn. Here are some reports: "Colorado State College: Two students were confirmed last month by Student Pastor Theo. A. Meyer"; or: "The average church attendance at services conducted by Student Pastor Weber at Purdue University is 199. The average contribution is 44 cents per worshiper. The total number of Synodical Conference students at Purdue is 375"; or: "Student Pastor Heintzen's group of 471 at the University of Illinois includes 89 women, 247 veterans, 91 married students." And these are only a few of the numerous reports of signal success reported by Rev. R. W. Hahn. "My Word shall not return unto Me void" (Is. 55:11). J. T. M.

The End of "Cuius Regio, Eius Religio."—In the *Theological Quarterly* (*Quartalschrift*) of the Wisconsin Synod (July, 1948) Mr. Eugene Wengert, a prominent Lutheran attorney and leading Lutheran layman, offers an excellent article on the implications

of the well-known formula *cuius regio, eius religio*, adopted as a recognized doctrine of politics in the Religious Treaty of Augsburg, 1555. The doctrine, though practically repudiated at the close of the Thirty Years' War in 1648, was not fully abrogated until the constitutionalism of America brought forth a new political doctrine of religious freedom in the Bill of Rights. We believe our readers will appreciate the following paragraph of Mr. Wengert's article even though they must read it removed from its context: "The century from 1555 to 1648, having adopted as the *raison d'état* *cuius regio, eius religio*, was without doubt the most gruesome and perverted in the annals of Christian thought. In the emphasis on religious warfare it must not be assumed that in practical effect the formula evolved in the Treaty of Augsburg had its repercussions only in Germany and ended with the Thirty Years' War. On the contrary, such a perspective would be altogether too narrow. Its principles embraced every European nation impregnated with the ideas of the Reformation and became the constitutional norm for the ecclesiastical and political policy of the State. It was clearly an attempt to import into the State the ideology of the Israelitic theocracy, where disloyalty to the State was blasphemy against Jehovah. The literature of the time abounds with repetitious references to personages and incidents of the Old Testament in proof that the State is God's direct institution, as was the Church, and therefore it must not only protect religion but also sponsor and advance true doctrine. However, it is not our intention to discuss the physical aspects of the religious wars of this period. These facts can be found in any textbook. Our intention is to trace social and political ideas and their impact upon the Christian Church. Hence, before proceeding farther in our investigations to discover the new ideas, tendencies, and movements in this world, it is quite important for comparative purposes to advert once more to the position of Luther. He had indicated precisely the area of activity for Church and State in matters of heresy. On the question of absolute and passive obedience to secular authority, he had conceded the implicit right to resistance and even deposition of the emperor if he violated his oath of office and refused compliance with the constitutional prescriptions. In other words, he had substituted a regimen of law for ruled and ruler instead of the arbitrary will of the ruler regardless of law. Although Luther's perspicacity into the reality of things was never pursued to its logical end, yet this view established in the progress of political theory two basic principles: First, no emperor, ruler, or king is above the constitutional law of the State and his oath of office, or to use the phrase of the Civilians, he is not any longer to be regarded as *princeps legibus solutus*; secondly, although less precisely, the individual Christian may refuse obedience to secular powers when his religious convictions are the object of the attack. Thus in the orderly process of social and political development the century here under review should have compelled the conclusion in Lutheran thinking that man functions in a dual capacity in the

social and the political order. He is bound by the social institutions of time in his secular existence, but transcends time in his divinely preordained destiny for eternity. In the one area the State and secular institutions function by trial and error and are the result of social experience; in the other the divine institution of the Church functions by revelation. Therefore, in the evolution of the idea of freedom from the state-control of religion and in the development of the new conception of religious liberty and of the separation of religion from institutionalism and animosities, the contribution of theological thinkers was admittedly inconsequential. Progress toward and consummation of an explicit doctrine of separation must be credited to the Civilians, who were not so much interested and motivated in securing peace for the Church as they were in stabilizing the political foundations of the State. But it must not be inferred that the tendency ripened at once into maturity. A new idea is a delicate plant and needs the utmost care and cultivation. Its final fruition came in the constitutionalism of America through the enlightened rationalism of Jefferson despite the opposition from the politically entrenched religion. Hence the theory was juridical and not theological. The dominant concept of the Christian religion is the love of God. The dominant characteristic of society and the social institution of the State is the sanction and coercion of the law. In their antithesis neither the State nor the Church can adopt the function of the other without denying its specific purpose and attributes." — As proof of the perspicacity and fairness of the great Lutheran political leader Gustavus Adolphus, it might be said here that even during the Thirty Years' War he fully recognized and protected the religious and civil rights of Roman Catholic subjects in the areas which he had subdued. Humanly speaking, it is quite believable that had the King of Sweden dictated the Peace of Westphalia, Europe would have been blessed with a Bill of Rights, similar to the one we have in our country today.

J. T. M.

Religious Freedom and Roman Catholicism. — Among the matters that are widely discussed these days on account of the Supreme Court decision pertaining to the Champaign case is the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward religious liberty. The Roman Catholics themselves have joined in the debate and are furnishing contributions. One of their number, Wilfred Parsons, a Jesuit, has issued a book called *The First Freedom, Considerations on Church and State in the United States*. An important review of this book has appeared in the *Christian Century* of August 25, written by the review editor of the journal, Dr. W. E. Garrison. There are various reasons why this review should be widely read. One of them is that it contains quotations from authoritative Catholic sources showing what the real position of the Roman Catholic Church is toward religious freedom and separation of Church and State. In order that our readers may have this material at their elbow, we shall quote the most important

statements: "Pope Pius IX declared it an error to say 'that in the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.'" "Pope Leo XIII deplored the 'un-rightful position' unto which the Church is driven or when the Catholic religion is allowed a standing in civil society equal only, or inferior, to societies alien from it.'" "Msgr. John A. Ryan writes: 'Should non-Catholics be permitted to practice their own forms of worship? If these are carried on within the family, or in such an inconspicuous manner as to be an occasion neither of scandal nor perversion to the faithful, they may be properly tolerated by the State.' To this he adds the familiar words which stand unaltered in the current edition of his book: 'Superficial champions of religious liberty will promptly and indignantly denounce the foregoing propositions as the essence of intolerance. They are intolerant, but not therefore unreasonable. Error has not the same rights as truth. Since the profession and practice are contrary to human welfare, how can error have rights?' Coming right down to 1948, we find the official Jesuit organ in Rome, *Civiltà Cattolica*, in its April issue (see *Christian Century*, June 23), with unaccustomed frankness giving this gem of Catholic wisdom: 'The Roman Catholic Church, convinced through its divine prerogative, of being the only true Church, must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the Church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that, by legitimate means, they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a State where the majority of people are Catholic, the Church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually insist, they shall have only a *de facto* existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs. If, however, actual circumstances, either due to government hostilities or the strength of the dissenting groups, makes the complete application of the principle impossible, then the [Catholic] Church will require for herself all possible concessions, limiting herself to accepting, as a minor evil, the *de jure* toleration of other forms of worship. . . . The Church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice.'

Commenting on these official utterances Dr. Garrison says: "Here, then, are the official papal and Jesuit pronouncements on 'religious liberty' and on the equality of churches before the law. Father Parsons does not dare to repeat them in this book, but he does not dare to disclaim them. They are not the statements of fringe fanatics, but the considered declarations of the head of his Church and high representatives of his own order. These are the basic presuppositions behind his argument that the Constitution of the United States supports a type of Church-State relationship with equally proportioned aid to all churches—a system in which he cannot believe but which he defends as a step toward a happier arrangement under which 'error' will have no rights."

In spite of the assertions of some Roman Catholics to the contrary, it is very evident that their own authorities do not consider the conditions under which we live, where there is freedom of religion and of religious expression for all, as ideal, but merely as something that has to be tolerated till something better can be achieved.

A.

Atheists and Broadcasting.—According to a *Religious News Service* dispatch from Washington, radio stations in this country will not be punished for refusing broadcasting time to atheists. This was stated by the Federal Communications Commission. A Protestant churchman, two Roman Catholic priests, a Jewish rabbi, and an atheist had appeared as witnesses before the special House Committee investigating F. C. C.'s stand on religion on the air. Commissioner Hyde said the F. C. C.'s 1946 Scott Decision, which upheld the right of atheists to broadcast their views, had been misinterpreted as meaning that atheists must receive radio time equal to that given religious programs. He told the House group that radio stations need fear no F. C. C. reprisal if they gave atheists less time or no time." The 1946 ruling followed a demand by Robert H. Scott of Palo Alto, Calif., that three California stations have their licenses revoked for refusing to grant him time for atheistic programs. Scott's petition was rejected by the F. C. C., but in its decision the Commission held that atheists had the right to air their viewpoint. Many stations subsequently interpreted this as establishing a policy calling on them to give atheists an equal opportunity to present their views if they gave or sold time for religious broadcasts. Commissioner Hyde in testifying before the Congressional Committee stated "that the Scott case emphasized the fact that in exercising its own judgment a radio station should not deny anyone air time on a controversial issue solely because it does not agree with the opposite viewpoint. He pointed out that an organization or an idea which might otherwise not be entitled to radio time 'may be projected into the realm of controversy by virtue of being attacked.' He gave as his personal point of view that Sunday broadcasts of religious services would not give atheists a right to reply with equal time."—This is reassuring information.

A.

Hromadka Answered by Niebuhr.—Those of our readers who have perused accounts of the World Council of Churches meeting in Amsterdam will recall that a widely reported speech made by Prof. Joseph Hromadka of Prague, Czechoslovakia, attacked Western civilization and the social system which it sponsors. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Seminary in New York answered him. Addressing the World Council of Churches, he admitted many points in Prof. Hromadka's attack on the West, but "asserted that he was wrong in presenting the Soviet system as a possible alternative to the Western way of life." Giving a brief report of Dr. Niebuhr's speech, the *Religious News Service* says that the New York theologian stressed that the real tragedy of our age lies in the

"horrible evils generated by the Communist alternative to our civilization. Hell knows no fury like that of a prophet of a secular religion who has become the priest-king of a Utopian state. The ramparts of our civilization may be tattered, but they contain defenses of freedom which require that we support them against this new fury."

A.

Find Protestantism in Indianapolis Not Attracting Men (R. N. S.).—Protestantism in Indianapolis lacks attraction for men, is failing to reach low income groups, and is barely keeping pace with the population growth of the city.

These facts were revealed in a report based on a detailed statistical study of Protestant churches here compiled by Dr. Frederick A. Shippey, director of research for the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church.

The survey showed that:

1. Only 29.2 per cent of all Protestant church members are males.

2. Laborers—who comprise over 26 per cent of the employed population—make up only 8.6 per cent of Protestant church membership.

3. Between 1930 and 1945, when Indianapolis grew 15.6 per cent, church membership increased by 16 per cent.

4. In spite of the population growth, Sunday school enrollment between 1930 and 1945 dropped 10.3 per cent.

5. An average of only 31.4 per cent of Indianapolis Protestants attend Sunday morning services and only 6.9 per cent attend evening services.

6. An estimated 50,000 persons of the Protestant faith are unreached by the churches.

Other findings disclosed by the survey were that less than half of the Protestant church membership contributes regularly to the churches; and Protestant preachers are poorly paid.

The survey indicated that 37.1 per cent of the ministers make between \$2,000 and \$3,000; 17.7 per cent earn between \$1,000 and \$2,000; 24.8 per cent get \$3,000 to \$4,000; and only 7.1 per cent receive over \$5,000.

Dr. Shippey said the survey proved that "urban church work is not sufficiently aimed at males" and that "few churches have a vital program for adult males."

He said the survey advanced 11 recommendations to improve the Protestant church situation here. Among these were:

1. Broadening of pastoral counseling to include juvenile delinquency, adult crime, alcoholism, racial problems, and labor-management problems.

2. A house-to-house religious census to locate "the many thousands of unchurched residents."

3. A study of occupational distribution of church membership.

4. Appointment of an interdenominational committee to study the Sunday school situation thoroughly.

5. Investigation of the small percentage of church members who contribute regularly to financial support of the church; and

6. Leadership training schools for Sunday school officers.

The survey here was conducted under the auspices of the comity committee of the Church Federation of Indianapolis.

Romanism Adds. — Ernest Gordon, in the *Sunday School Times* (August 14, 1948), calls attention to the fact that while Rome retains essential fundamentals of the Christian faith, it adds to these fundamentals pernicious teachings, by which the Christian doctrine is obscured or even set aside. The papacy, in other words, hedges in true doctrine by means of false, unscriptural doctrines which imperil the salvation of the members of the papal church. He writes: "Pius XII asked visitor J. Frank Norris what Fundamentalists believed. He replied: In a supernaturally born Savior, a supernaturally risen Lord, by whose death we have salvation. The Pope smiled and said that he believed that too." Then Dr. Gordon writes: "But the trouble is that he and his followers believe other things too. In the *Converted Catholic* mention is made of a booklet by the Jesuit Father Delaney, with the endorsement of Cardinal Spellman, on the fifteenth page of which is this sentence, addressed to priests and italicized by the author: 'By offering the Mass you *add* something to Calvary, you *almost improve* on Calvary.' And in another book, officially endorsed by Cardinal Stritch of Chicago, entitled 'Novena in Honor of the Immaculate Heart of Our Lady of Fatima,' one finds, on page 28, the words: 'Thou art the Gate of Heaven, O Mother beloved, no one shall enter save through thee.'" This tragic adding to the Christian doctrine may well be remembered in connection with our coming Reformation Festival, which demands of us, as does our whole Gospel witness, both *Lehre* and *Wehre*, that is, both positive statement of the evangelical truth and refutation, in clear, unmistakable terms, of Rome's soul-destroying errors. No man, not even the Pope at Rome, can *improve* on Calvary; any addition to the saving death of Christ on the Cross only destroys Calvary, so far as the believer is concerned. That becomes clear especially when Mary is made the "Gate of Heaven," without whose merit and intercession no one can enter eternal life. Luther's verdict that "Rome and the entire Papacy have lost the Gospel, because they no longer desired to hear Christ, but themselves began to preach" [what they liked], is fully justified by statements such as those quoted by Dr. Gordon (cf. St. Louis Ed., V. 1029 f.). However, as Dr. Gordon points out, despite its errors Rome continues to make converts and gain friends among Protestants. He writes: "M. Jacques Maritain, a convert from French Protestantism to

Romanism and at present ambassador of the French Republic to the Vatican, has been appointed professor of philosophy in Princeton University. In this connection it may be noted that the son of Mr. John Foster Dulles, who is marked to be the coming Secretary of State (himself a Presbyterian minister's son), is studying for the Roman Catholic priesthood in St. Andrews Jesuit College in Poughkeepsie; and also that Mr. Taylor, the Roosevelt-Truman ambassador to the Vatican, has given his fine establishment in Florence to a Dominican sisterhood." Still there are such in the Roman Church as find their way to Protestantism by the study of Scripture. Just now Antonio Gianvittorio, a former Catholic priest and professor in Italy, is studying theology at Concordia Seminary, and such cases are by no means rare. J. T. M.

British Methodists Reject the Idea of Ordaining Women as Ministers.—It had been widely forecast that this year's Methodist Conference in Great Britain would go on record as favoring the ordination of women pastors. While the matter previously had been sanctioned in principle, it was rejected when the issue confronted the Church in a definite proposal. The main reason for this negative attitude does not seem to have been the teaching of St. Paul on this subject, as given in 1 Corinthians 14 and 1 Timothy 2. The considerations which moved the members of the Conference were, at least to a large extent, of a practical nature. Methodist ministers are supposed to change parishes frequently, in order that they may not become worldly-minded and view a certain manse as their paradise. They are, figuratively speaking, to be in the frame of mind and have the equipment of the children of Israel at the Passover meal, with loins girded, shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand, Ex. 12:11. It would be a hardship for women pastors having families to be constantly on the move. We can understand that the women delegates at the Conference are said not at all to have been enamored of the plan to have members of their sex lead such itinerant lives. A.

Outward Growth of Christian Churches in the United States.—If the Kingdom of God depended on the number of the professed adherents of churches or religious organizations, the outlook in our country would be more favorable now than ever before. From New York comes the information that according to the compilations of the *Christian Century* about 58 per cent of our population claims membership in some religious society or denomination. In comparison with last year this means a gain of 3,716,006. The total is the largest number of people claiming some religious affiliation that has ever been reported. Analyzing the figures, one finds that in our country there are 46,149,676 Protestants, 25,286,178 Roman Catholics, and 4,641,000 Jews. Roman Catholics in the aggregate have been more successful in winning followers than Protestants. The percentage gain for the former is 3.5, while that of the Protestants is 2.6. A.

Brief Items from *Religious News Service***Concerning Protestants**

A conference of German Quakers expressed opposition to capital punishment. The conference declared that capital punishment "does not repair a crime, does not return life to the dead, and is ineffective as a deterrent."

The Methodist Church in the United States has thirty-five episcopal areas. Two new ones were added at the last quadrennial General Conference.

Seventh-Day Adventists will open 140 new schools in all parts of the country during the next year. The denomination now operates 290 colleges and high schools and 3,631 elementary schools, in which more than 157,000 pupils are enrolled. This information was given at a Youth's Congress of the Adventists held in Philadelphia. Five hundred young men and women pledged themselves to missionary service.

"Great Scenes from Great Plays," the new radio program sponsored by the Protestant Episcopal Church, is said to have the largest radio hook-up ever used to carry a church message. Every station of the Mutual Broadcasting Company and a number of independent stations will "air" the program. The number of stations used is estimated to be more than five hundred.

Three high lay officials of the Lutheran Church in Hungary have resigned, shortly after the Minister of Information in the Communist-dominated government had demanded a revamping of the Lutheran Synod. It is rumored that the Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass will soon announce his abdication, owing to government pressure.

At the fiftieth annual convention of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, an organization of Episcopal laymen meeting in Oxford, Ohio, the president, Mr. Samuel S. Schmidt of York, Pa., said, "Christianity began with twelve men listening to one Man, and these twelve men spread the principles of His teaching throughout the world." He urged his fellow-members to follow the example of their British brethren (whom he had just visited) to spread "the timeless good news of Christianity."

A resistance movement has been launched at Great Falls, Montana, in an effort to curb the invasion of the Hutterites into Montana. A plan is being drafted for driving these religious bands from the areas in which they have settled during the last few years. Oldest religious communistic society in the world, the Hutterites emigrated to the United States from Canada because of controversy and protest over their way of life. The charge is that Hutterite children are taught to speak German before they learn English, attend only the schools on grounds belonging to the sect,

and are segregated from all other youngsters not of their faith. An attorney representing the Hutterites and two members of the Augusta colony were denied admittance to the meeting. [The Hutterites, generally speaking, belong to the Mennonites.]

Concerning Roman Catholics

Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, the Primate of Hungary, was refused a passport by his Communist-dominated government when he expressed the desire to go to Cologne.

In Cologne the seven-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the famous cathedral was observed. 250,000 persons jammed the surrounding streets, seven cardinals and more than 35 archbishops and bishops participated in the rites. In the procession "the most precious shrine of the three kings," a huge silver and gold casket set with ivory and precious gems was carried on a cart.

Headed by Joseph Cardinal van Roey, Archbishop of Malien, the Belgian Roman Catholic hierarchy has issued a joint pastoral letter warning Catholic parents against sending their children to new schools being established throughout the country under State supervision.

From Montreal comes the news that Mayor Camillien Houde joined Catholic theologians of his city in signing a petition that the Holy See proclaim as dogma the bodily assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven.

A statement issued by the Catholic hierarchy of Germany, after a meeting of the prelates in Fulda, called on Catholics to work for the elimination of social inequalities in postwar Germany. It cautions them also against adding to "the misery of the poor" by charging high prices for scarce commodities.

There are sixty Benedictine abbeys in the United States. The Abbot Primate of the order, Rev. Bernard Kalein, has come from Rome to visit these institutions.

The Roman Catholic Church has launched its new English translation of the Old Testament, which will replace the Douay Version in the United States. The book of Genesis has now been printed. A group of more than thirty scholars is at work. In 1941 the same group issued a new translation of the New Testament. The translation is under the supervision of the Catholic Biblical Association of America. The printing is done by the St. Anthony Guild in Paterson, N. J. Among features of the new translation are the elimination of "Thou," "Thee," "Thy," and the substitution of "see" for "behold."



Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.

The Authority of the Biblical Revelation. By Hubert Cunliffe-Jones. The Pilgrim Press, Boston. 1948. 154 pages, 8¾×6. \$2.50.

Dr. Cunliffe-Jones' fine academic training and years of practical experience as a pastor and teacher have combined in producing this readable little volume. The author graduated from the University of Sydney and from Melbourne College of Divinity and received his B. Litt. degree from Oxford University. He spent six years in the ministry and has now been a theological teacher for eleven years. At present he is Principal and Tutor in Systematic Theology and Modern Church History at Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford, England.

In this volume the author attempts a refutation of pre-war Liberalism, which became confused in the absence of any belief in authority. He endeavors to show in what sense the Bible is finally authoritative for the Christian theologian so that he has no right to dissent from it. He does not disclaim the conclusions of the historical study of the Bible (Higher Criticism), but insists that "the constant interaction of the historical and the theological study of the Bible is necessary if the Bible is to be fully authoritative in declaring the gospel of the Blessed God" (p. 45). From this viewpoint he does not accept the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Bible, though he does not find it incongruous to insist on the witness of the Holy Spirit in the gospel. He explains that the gospel to which the Bible bears witness has been communicated to men by the Holy Spirit and that the understanding of this gospel is a human response also inspired by the Holy Spirit (p. 111).

Dr. Cunliffe-Jones admits that this book is not the exposition of a fully worked-out theological standpoint, but a program for hard work. He is correct. If the conflicting claims of the higher critics are to be fused with the teachings of the Bible so as to constitute a harmonious theological entity, it will take more than the dialectical skill and the untiring diligence of a modern Aquinas or a whole school of schoolmen to bring this about.

There is much in this small volume that should prove stimulating to the advanced Bible student, even where he may feel compelled to take issue with the author. It is interesting to see how the author regards the Old Testament in the light of the New and vice versa. It is gratifying to note that he finds Christ the Lord in both Testaments. His testimony to the witness of the Holy Spirit in the Bible is commendable. One can only pray that this witness may eventually lead him all the way to accept the whole Bible as the inerrant Word of God.

L. W. SPITZ

Revision or New Translation? "The Revised Standard Version of 1946." A Comparative Study by Oswald T. Allis. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. 1948. 164 pages, 5½×8¾. \$2.00.

It is very proper that the translation of the New Testament known as the Revised Standard Version is studied, examined,

and evaluated by the best and most consecrated scholarship which the English-speaking world possesses. No one who has followed the career of Prof. Oswald T. Allis will deny that he in many respects is peculiarly qualified for making a study like the one in question. He received his education at the University of Pennsylvania, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton University, and the University of Berlin, at which latter institution he earned his Ph. D. From 1910 to 1929 he taught in the department of Semitic Philology at Princeton Seminary, first as instructor and then as assistant professor. After that he served for seven years as professor in the Old Testament department of Westminster Theological Seminary. For twelve years he was faculty editor of the well-known *Princeton Theological Review*. Of late his name has been before the theological public as author of *The Five Books of Moses* (1943), *Bible Numerics* (1944), and *Prophecy and the Church* (1945). While his specialty is the Old Testament, he certainly is well qualified to judge of work in general that has to do with the Bible and its translation.

What makes us approach the work of Dr. Allis with much sympathy is that he accepts the Scriptures as the infallible Word of God and as the sole source of our doctrines. The task of examination is done in a scholarly way. The verdict arrived at is quite negative. Before entering upon it, the chapter headings should be submitted, so that the reader may get an idea of the line of thought which the author follows. I. The Version of 1611 and Its Revisions. II. Accuracy of Rendering — the Use of Italics. III. "Idiomatic" Translation. IV. Words and Their Meanings. V. The Word Order in Translation. VI. The Form of the Translation. VII. Dogmatism and Inconsistency. VIII. The "Enduring Diction" of the Authorized Version. IX. Is the Revised Standard Version a Liberal Version? These chapters are followed by a conclusion and an appendix. The latter gives information on the revisers with respect to their theological attitude. An index of Scripture passages closes the volume. Of all the evaluations of the Revised Standard Version which we have seen this study is not only the most extensive, but likewise the most penetrating.

One regret which Dr. Allis expresses we altogether share. It is this, that the commission which gave us the Revised Standard Version consisted almost altogether of men that represented a liberal course in theological thinking. It is a pity that conservative scholarship was not more widely represented among the members of that committee. Is conservative scholarship in America incapable of furnishing an up-to-date translation of the New Testament or of the whole Bible? We are loath to believe anything of the kind. The men that did the revising are eminent scholars, but there are good scholars on the other side of the fence, too. Will a translator's personal religious attitude become manifest when he renders the Bible into his own tongue? We believe to a certain extent this is unavoidable. Dr. Moffatt in the introduction to his own translation of the New Testament said that a translator cannot help becoming an interpreter. This is very true, and it lends emphasis to the point made by Dr. Allis that it is unfortunate that the committee responsible for the Revised Standard Version was so largely composed of Liberals.

Another general viewpoint of the author we do not share.

He complains that the Revised Standard Version is called a revision. If it were called a new translation, he would not object to it so strongly as he does now. To our way of thinking the principles followed by the revisers had to lead to the kind of translation which lies before us. They strove for accuracy, as every honest translator will. Besides, however, they desired to let the New Testament speak to us in the modern idiom. To do this, it was necessary to change the diction in innumerable places. The results, generally speaking, are satisfactory. If the revisers had been free to furnish a new translation of their own, we have no doubt an altogether different work would have been produced, as is evident from the modern-language translations of Moffatt and Goodspeed, two members of the revising committee. Hence we think that on this point Dr. Allis has not such a firm foundation to stand on as in some other matters. After all, what the religious world desired was a translation which would not only be accurate, but readable and couched in our modern language. Whether all the changes which the revisers introduced were really necessary will always remain a matter of opinion; here taste and sentiment play an important role. One must not forget that in this sphere we are dealing with the intangibles of speech and thought, where an absolute and universally recognized standard simply cannot be established.

A distressing thought which Dr. Allis brings before us has to do with the use of the New Testament by our children and our youth. In past generations the memorizing of the chief passages of the Scripture was stressed, a course which was greatly facilitated through the universal acceptance of the Authorized Version among English-speaking Protestants. It was one of the joys of religious persons and teachers to see how firmly imbedded many of the most important prooftexts of the Scriptures were in the minds of people, largely owing to the supremacy of one particular version of the Scriptures. It is indeed to be feared that with the passing of the Authorized Version and the chaos resulting from the multitude of modern versions about us, the memorizing of important Bible texts will be greatly hindered—till the Revised Standard Version will be firmly intrenched, if that condition will ever come about. It is the price which this generation has to pay for obtaining a Bible translation in its own peculiar idiom.

In the chapter entitled "Dogmatism and Inconsistency," Dr. Allis properly points out that the translation "married only once" in 1 Tim. 3:2 for "husband of one wife" is definitely due to a strange bias; no reader of the original Greek, if uninfluenced by ulterior considerations, would find in the phrase the significance given it by the revisers. The same criticism must be directed against the rendering of 1 Cor. 7:37 "to keep her as his betrothed." The *bridegroom* is conceived of as the subject of the sentence, while according to the Authorized Version's view, which is the usual one, it is the *father* of whom the Apostle is speaking. Into the same category Dr. Allis rightly places the rendering of Gal. 4:3 "elementary spirits of the universe." We furthermore agree with him when he castigates the translation of Rom. 9:5 "God who is over all be blessed forever," where the revisers assume the insertion of a doxology, while the words, read without bias, ascribe deity

to our blessed Savior. We do not agree with him, however, when he disapproves of the rendering of Rom. 11:25 "a hardening has come upon a part of Israel"—a rendering which is in keeping with the larger context.

A number of other points touched on in the book could profitably be discussed, but it will be better to direct all who are interested to the treatise itself. Having heard of a number of people who through this new version have come to read the Scriptures with greater delight and benefit than ever before, we hesitate to join in the negative verdict at which Dr. Allis arrives. Every conservative Bible scholar, and perhaps most liberal ones, too, will admit that the new translation is not perfect. But what must be decided is the question whether the advantages connected with the use of the new version do not outweigh the disadvantages to such an extent that the wide use of the new translation should be advocated. We are inclined to vote affirmatively. W. ARNDT

Luther and Music. By Paul Nettl. The Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1948. \$2.25. 174 pages, 5¼×7¾.

We most heartily recommend this fine little volume to our pastors. Its author, Dr. Paul Nettl, was at one time head of the Department of Musicology at the University of Prague and is at present a member of the Music Department of the University of Indiana. Much that is contained in Dr. Nettl's book may be found also in Hans Preuss' *Martin Luther der Kuenstler*. However, since the war has likely made the Preuss book unavailable, the book prepared by Dr. Nettl is all the more valuable. The liturgical revival of our day is accompanied by a revival of interest in church music and Christian hymnody. Since Luther plays such an important part in all of these fields, and since Dr. Nettl has included also much information of post-Luther days and developments, not only our pastors, but also our church musicians and lay people will benefit by reading it. The book was written simply and lucidly and makes for enjoyable reading. There are points where one might differ with the author, but they involve no major issue. The volume was dedicated to Dr. O. P. Kretzmann and Prof. Theo. Hoelty Nickel of Valparaiso University. WALTER E. BUSZIN

The Greatest Questions of the Bible and of Life. By Clarence E. Macartney. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York-Nashville, 1948. \$2.00. 223 pages, 5¼×7½.

The author of this collection of sermons is pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. All sermons of the volume are based on pregnant questions found in the Bible. The author's style is simple, his sermons are carefully thought out and uplifting, and all are interesting, some extremely so. Though there are occasional and even forceful references to salvation through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ, the weakness of the sermons, by and large, is that they are not Christ-centered Gospel sermons. This is, of course, a failing of much modern preaching and, despite all the attractive moralizing done, the results are according in our enlightened twentieth century. As soon as sermons are not saturated with the proclamation of sin and grace, they fall short of their real purpose. In defense of Mr. Macartney we

might add, however, that his sermons show, at least at times, that he personally believes and proclaims salvation through Christ. We of the Lutheran Church believe this should be done clearly and forcefully in every sermon.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:

Portals of Prayer. No. 85. **Sing Unto the Lord.** Daily Devotions from August 21 to October 7, 1948. By Dr. J. C. Schuelke of Peoria, Ill. Single copies, 10 cents; subscription for 7 numbers, 50 cents; 14 numbers, \$1.00; bulk price, 60 cents per dozen; \$4.50 per hundred; all postpaid.

Psalter und Harfe. Andachten fuer die Zeit vom 21. August bis zum 7. Oktober 1948. By Rev. A. H. Lange, *em.*, Summit, Ill. Price same as above.

Portals of Prayer. No. 86. **For Our Learning.** Daily Devotions from October 8 to November 25, 1948. By Rev. Martin Walker of Buffalo, N. Y. Single copies, 10 cents; subscription for 7 numbers, 50 cents; 14 numbers, \$1.00; bulk price, 60 cents per dozen; \$4.50 per hundred; all postpaid.

Joseph — Der Erretter seines Volks — Andachten fuer die Zeit vom 8. Oktober bis zum 24. November 1948. Price same as above.

Concordia Bible Teacher — Jonah and Micah — Vol. X, No. 1, October—December, 1948.

Concordia Bible Student — Jonah and Micah — Vol. XXXVIII, No. 1, October—December, 1948.

Both edited by Rev. J. M. Weidenschilling, S. T. D., under the auspices of the Board for Parish Education, The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod.

Steps to the Marriage Altar. Tract No. 156. By Rudolph Prange, 10 cents.

With This Ring. Tract No. 158. By E. H. Heintzen. 20 cents.

We Baptize Children. Tract No. 157. By Dr. J. T. Mueller. 10 cents.

Be Baptized. Tract No. 155. By Dr. J. T. Mueller. 10 cents.

On Using Profanity. Tract No. 161. By Edwin Kurth. 10 cents.

Friendship. Tract No. 162. By Richard Jesse. 10 cents.

The Hope of Tomorrow. Rally Day Program. By Allan H. Jahsmann. 16 pages. Single copy, 8 cents.

Luther, Man of God. Reformation Day Program. By Edgar J. Mundinger. 11 pages. 5 cents.

From American Book-Stratford Press, Inc., New York:

World Empire. Communism's Great Challenge. By Jerry Walker. 72 pages, 5½ × 8½. 50 cents.

From the Beacon Press, Boston, Mass.:

Consider the Children — How They Grow. By Elizabeth M. Manwell and Sophia L. Fahs. 261 pages, 5½ × 8. \$1.75.

From Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.:

Making a Go of Life. Daily Guidance in Purposeful Living. By Roy L. Smith. 346 pages, $4\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$. \$1.00.

How to Build Up Your Church School. By Weldon Crossland. 144 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. \$1.50.

From Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.:

Marian's Favorite Bible Stories. By Marian Schoolland. Illustrated by Dirk Gringhuis. 128 pages, $6\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$. \$1.50.

White Queen of the Cannibals. By A. J. Bueltmann. 106 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. 60 cents.

From The Lutheran Colportage Service, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.:

Altar Steps. By Rev. R. P. Haakonson. 375 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$2.00.

From The Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, Pa.:

What About Scandinavia? By Carl C. Rassmussen. 194 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$2.25.

You Shall Be My Witnesses. By William S. Avery and Royal E. Leshner. 144 pages, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{4}$. 90 cents.

From Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis.:

Why "Missourian," by Wm. Dallmann, D.D. 24 pages, 4×6 . Single copy, 15 cents.

From the Pilgrim Press, Chicago, Ill.:

Bible Homes and Homes Today. By Elizabeth L. Reed. VIII and 151 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. \$1.00.

From the Warner Press, Anderson, Ind.:

Topics for the Young People's Society, No. 12. Prepared by Vivian Ahrendt. 97 pages, $4\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$. 60 cents.

From Wetzel Publishing Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.:

Fascinating Bible Plays. By Betty L. Gabrielson. 195 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$2.00.

From The Pilgrim Press, Boston, Mass.:

Minister's Monday. By Robert L. Eddy. 175 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. \$2.25.

From The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio:

The Lonely Road. Tract. By Edward F. Rice. 15 pages. 10 cents.

From W. A. Wilde Company, Boston, Mass.:

Windows of Thought. By David R. Piper. 148 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$1.50.

